2014

Parental Involvement in the College-going Process: A Q Methodology Study

Glori White Peters
University of North Florida

PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE COLLEGE GOING PROCESS:

A Q METHODOLOGY STUDY

by

Glori White Peters

A dissertation submitted to the

Department of Leadership, School Counseling, and Sports Management

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Educational Leadership

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

November, 2014

Certificate of Approval

Acknowledgements

The fifteen-year journey to the completion of this dissertation has finally come to an end. I am eternally grateful to all who traveled with me, most especially those who planted the very first seeds that fueled my passion for teaching and learning. To my beloved grandparents, my first teachers, who taught me how to dream big, to work hard and to always remember, "I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me." In my early years, my grandmother modeled what it meant to have a servants' heart especially regarding the least advantaged. My mother and father, both avid learners, instilled within me the pursuit of life-long learning. Although they all sing with the angels now, their loving spirits covered me through the times that I said this was too hard and the times I just wanted to quit.

In many ways, I feel that this degree belongs to the many students and their parents who have over these past fifteen years, fed my words of encouragement and strength right back to me saying, "GP, you got this." To an incredible group of parents, who have become part of my family, I say thanks for your unyielding support of all my efforts. To my former UB staff, especially mama Cruz, for her strident admonishment and loving encouragement to "get this thing done", I owe you a debt of gratitude. To Ms. CeeCee for her research assistance and to Stephen and Margo Kennedy, two of my biggest cheerleaders, I thank you all.

This effort began in 1999, with Dr. Joyce T. Jones at the helm. Thanks to her for helping to flesh out my thoughts, which brought me to a very clear research focus. I shall never forget our chats at her kitchen table, coffee always ready. I also thank Dr. Jones for her visionary wisdom in passing the baton to Dr. Chris Janson.

To an incredible committee, whose tireless efforts and sacrifices have helped me to birth this vision. To Dr. E. Newton Jackson, for his keen eye to the detailed element of APA style and most especially, for that fateful day that we initially met and he said to me, "Your name is on my list to be dismissed from the program." I appreciate him for giving me another chance. To Dr. JeffriAnne Wilder, thanks for her vivid insight into the racial and class barriers that exclude our most needy from reaching their dreams, and providing a broader frame for this research effort.

I am eternally grateful to Dr. Sophie Maxis for agreeing to co-chair the committee. It has been her words of encouragement, her gentle calmness, and her pursuit of excellence that have helped me to "keep it moving." To Dr. Chris Janson, (we should own stock in Starbucks) for the sacrifices he and his family have made so that I could reach my goal. I am in awe of his knowledge and application of Q Methodolgy and hope that we will work together on future Q research endeavors. You are a beast! Thanks to Dr. Warren Hodge for offering suggestions utilized to clarify elements of methodology and theoretical framework.

Thanks to my support crew at COJ for their encouragement and especially to Thomas Waters for working with me to accomplish this goal, and to Terry Powell and Steven Lewis for their technical assistance in formatting spreadsheets and word documents.

Thanks to my sister Maryiam Joy, for her technical support and editing skills and for her undying love for her big sister. Thanks to Andrea Jill, my niece, for her data entry and helping me to complete tables and exhibits. Thanks to my brother Lt. Col. Wayne H. White and my sister-in-law, Crystal Melissa for their prayers from a distance. I thank my three incredible children Stanley Jr, Terrance Eugene and Simone Lynette for their support and encouragement from beginning to end, especially to Simone for her role as research assistant.

Finally, I say thanks to my amazing husband, Terry Peters, who is my greatest ally and my best friend. This endeavor would never have seen the light of day had it not been for his support. I appreciate him being my gatekeeper throughout this entire process. When it got too stressful he knew when to "sit me down." When I got too lazy, he knew just what to say to get me working again. When I was in a zone, he made sure that all the conditions where conducive to keeping me focused. He is truly my greatest gift from God. My dear, I love you, madly!

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

This study explored parent perspectives about their participation in a federal TRIO pre-college program. Specifically, parents were asked to identify the program elements that encouraged and supported their participation in the college-going process of their child in a TRIO pre-college program. Forty parents of low-income, first generation TRIO students were purposefully selected for this study because they had participated in the parent component and because their child had enrolled in college within a year of high school graduation.

Q methodology was used for this study because it is designed to address the subjective first person viewpoint. In this Q study, the forty parents were asked to sort 33 value statements according to what was most like their perspective and least like their perspective, with regard to the program elements that encouraged and supported their participation. The 33 statements were derived from the current research on parental involvement and a parent survey to produce the Q-sort. Parents were also asked to explain why they sorted the statements holding the highest and lowest positions, as they did.

Subsequently, the parents identified five particular program elements that encouraged and supported their involvement in the college-going process. These factors were named: (a) A sense of community ”village”, (b) A sense of shared accountability and increased parental self-efficacy (c) A sense of the parent and student increasing social capital, (d) A sense of program relevance and (e) A sense of having highly committed program staff.

The research findings have implications for program development, program practices, and staff training. Recommendations for future research have been included.

Chapter 1

At a national TRIO conference, an informal conversation with my college access colleagues ensued around the issue of parent involvement. We represented TRIO directors from different states, programs and levels of experience and concurred that there was a marked lack of parent involvement in TRIO programs across the country. Some program directors, however, reported a degree of success in their parent programs and the discussion expanded around the elements that they thought were effective in motivating parent participation. It is within this context that the notion to explore parent viewpoints about their own motivation to participate took root. Parents, giving voice to their program experiences about what motivated their participation in the TRIO program, will support the growing body of literature that substantiates the benefits of parent involvement in the college preparation of their child.

Research on parent involvement provides compelling evidence that family involvement is critical to student success from pre-school to college (Barnes & Weikart, 1993; Berla & Henderson, 1994; Lunenberg & Ornstein, 2000; Olmstead & Rubin, 1983; Schweinhart, Barnes & Weikart, 1993; Weikart, 1988) Parent involvement is a strong predictor of student academic achievement and has positively predicted students' achievement test scores (Benner & Mistry, 2007; Neuenschwander, Vida, Garret, & Eccles, 2007; Singh, Bicklely, Trivette, Keith, & Anderson 1995; Zhan, 2006) as well as grade point average (GPA) (Seyfried & Chung, 2002). Researchers report that parent involvement is positively associated with higher rates of students aspiring to attend college and actually enrolling (Cabrera & La Nasa, 2000; Horn & Nunez,

2000; Hossler, Schmidt, & Vesper, 1999;) and decreased likelihood of high school dropout and truancy (McNeal, 2001).

Parent and family involvement tends to be higher in elementary and middle school grades but declines significantly as students reach high school (Epstein, 1995). High school students pursuing higher education fare better in the pursuit of the college degree if there is persistent and effective parent and family involvement in the college-going process (Tierney, 2001; Wimberly & Noeth, 2005). This is especially the case for students who come from low-income backgrounds and whose parents have not obtained a college degree (Jeynes, 2011).

Consistent parent involvement, as demonstrated through various parent practices, helps to chart a student's course to college. Parent practices that have proven most helpful in preparing students for college include, but are not limited to, advocating for rigorous and college preparatory high school curriculum (Brown, Rocha & Sharkey, 2005), monitoring homework (Clark, 1983; Finn, 1993; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995; Keith & Keith, 1993) participating in school activities (Epstein, 2001; Stevenson & Baker, 1987;) providing a positive learning environment in the home (Clark, 1983; Epstein, 1987; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbush, & Darling, 1987), providing test preparation (Tierney, 2004) attendance at school programs, conferences and extracurricular activities (Steinberg, 1996) and working with school officials to help parents and students navigate the college-going and financial aid processes (Tierney, 2001). Often students from low-income households, whose parents have never attended college, generally have much less knowledge, information and social capital necessary to understand and navigate the college-going process, which includes planning for a postsecondary education

(Noguera, 2001; Wimberly & Noeth, 2004).

Students whose parents never finished college are referred to as first-generation (Thayer, 2000). Parents who have graduated with a college degree are more likely to transmit higher education values to their children by providing resources like SAT preparation courses, and assistance with college and scholarship applications (Fallon, 1997; Hossler, Schmidt, & Vesper, 1999). The information and resource gap is further widened for first generation students whose parents or caregivers have never navigated the college going process (Tierney, 2004). Evidence suggests that first generation students perceived less family support, a lower level of value placed on college by parents, and less knowledge about the college environment (Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak, & Terenzini, 2004). McCarron and Inkelas (2006) found that parent involvement was clearly the best predictor of education aspirations.

Disparities in college degree attainment between first generation students and non-first generation students have been found in academic preparation, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status (SES), experience of college culture shock and family and parent involvement in the college going process (Billson & Terry, 1982; Horn & Nunez, 2000; Terenzini, Springer, Yaeger, Pascarella, & Nora, 1996). According to McCarron and Inkelas (2006) the differences between the two types of families play a major role in the educational aspirations and attainment of first generation students, from college preparation to college completion. Thus, students who would be the first in their families to go college are realizing that in order to gain equal footing with their more affluent peers, they must obtain a college degree (Fallon, 1997).

Upon entering college, first generation students encounter challenges that are unique to

their experiences on campus compared to non-first generation students (Terenzini et al., 1996). Social capital refers to skills related to such processes as navigating a college campus environment, knowing campus values, accessing campus resources, and a general familiarity with functioning in a higher education setting (Bourdieu, 1977; Coleman, 1988). Both cultural and social capital has been found to be major factors when engaging in the college-going process (Coleman, 1988; McDonough, 1998, Perna & Titus, 2005). First-generation students tend to be minority students and come from low-income families (Choy 2001; Horn & Nunez, 2000; Terenzini et al., 1997), generally lack cultural and social capital related to navigating the processes of being on a college campus. Consequently, first-generation students may lack the cultural and social capital needed to succeed in a college environment (Inman & Mayes, 1999).

Although separate definitions have been offered to help describe students from low-income backgrounds and first generation to college, the concepts are conjoined in several areas including postsecondary access, and developmental outcomes for the purposes of this study (Gupton, Castelo-Rodriguez, Martinez & Quintanar, 2009). Research has shown that most students who come from low-income backgrounds will tend to also be first generation to college (McCarron & Inkelas, 2006). College students from low-income households tend to have experiences that are very similar (socially, culturally and academically) to those of first generation college students (McSwain & Davis, 2007).

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to explore parent perceptions about the elements that encouraged and supported parent and family involvement in a college preparatory program.

Parent and family involvement is defined as a set of group-defining actions, beliefs and attributes that serve as an operational factor in defining categorical differences among families from different racial-ethnic and economic backgrounds (Desimone, 1999). Q methodology is tied to participant perspectives so the need for an operational definition of parent involvement is diminished because parents will essentially define parent involvement through their own frame of reference.

Research Question

This study explored parent perceptions about their experiences while participating in a college preparatory TRIO program with their child. Specifically, the study identified the experiences that parents reported that most encouraged and supported their participation in the postsecondary preparation of their child in a federally- funded TRIO Program. Such program experiences included but were not limited to, college entrance test preparation, academic counseling, mentoring, academic advising for the college preparatory curriculum, college tours, a summer residential component, year round supplemental instruction in math, science, literature and composition, and foreign language and community service and student leadership activities. The research question for this study was, "What were parent perceptions of TRIO program elements that supported and encouraged their involvement in their children's college-going process?" This research question was reflected by the following question posed to parent participants during both the construction of the research instrument, or Q sample, and during the data collection through participant Q sorts: "What were the program elements that encouraged and supported parent and family involvement in the postsecondary preparation of your child in

the TRIO Program?"

Conceptual Framework

This study utilized level one of the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Parent Involvement Model (2005) to operationalize motivational factors related to parents making meaning of their experiences while participating in the college preparatory program and the college-going process. Along with the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Model (1997) the study explored the construct of social capital as it pertains to the postsecondary preparation of first-generation students who come from low-income backgrounds.

The Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Model (1997) examined specific predictors of parent involvement citing three major sources of parent motivation. The three motivational sources were components of Level One of this model. Parents' motivational beliefs, which included parent role construction and parent self-efficacy, constitute the first source of parent motivation. The second source was a parents' perception about being invited to be involved, from school staff and their child. The third source dealt with the parents' personal life context variables, that influence a parent's attitude about the forms and timing of involvement that seem practical, including parent's skill and knowledge for involvement, and time and energy for involvement (Green, Walker, Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2007).

A closer look at the motivational factors helped to support the use of level one of the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Model of Parent Involvement (1997). Parent role construction holds that a parent's view of the value and importance of education and parent involvement is related to the attitudes and values that were transmitted to them from their families of origin

(Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler 1995, 1997). For example, a parent may come from a home were the family believed it was solely the school's job to educate. This belief may increase understanding about why a parent is not inclined to participate in school activities.

Parent self-efficacy refers to a parent's perception of their ability to help their child. For example, a parent's ability to help can be reflected in the parents' confidence to help with homework, deal with challenging issues that include speaking one-on-one with teachers and school administrators, and other issues that may be intimidating or threatening to parents. The constructs of parent role construction and parent self-efficacy are part of the parent's motivational beliefs relevant to involvement (Green et al, 2007). The second factor, the parents' perception of invitations to be involved, is concerned with the parent being invited or required to participate by school personnel or their child. The third motivational source is personal life context variables that influence a parents' decision to participate (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005).

This study explored parent perceptions about why they participated in a parent program geared toward postsecondary preparation. Specifically, parents identified specific program elements that supported and encouraged their participation in the postsecondary preparation of their child, in a federally funded TRIO program, using elements of the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Model of Parent Involvement (1997) and Social Capital Theory (Bourdieu, 1977; Coleman, 1988) to provide a comparative focus, substantiating parent motivational factors based on specific program elements.

Methodology

This study was exploratory in nature seeking to uncover parent perceptions about program experiences that encouraged and supported their decision to participate in the college preparation of their child. Inquiry about parent perceptions called for a methodology that dealt with human subjectivity. For that reason, this study utilized Q methodology in exploring the research question, "What were parent perceptions of TRIO program elements that supported and encouraged their involvement in their children's college-going process?" Q methodology, originated and developed by William Stephenson, is a unique approach to problem analysis and a specialized set of statistical procedures and techniques. This methodology focuses on the "subjective or first-person viewpoints of its participants" (Stenner & Watt, 2012, p. 4). The core of Q methodology in this study will be the grouping of parent perspectives about the parent experiences according to the value that parents ascribe to them. Given the subjective, yet rigorous nature of Q methodology with its emphasis on first person perspectives, it is well suited for the examination of the research question.

Significance

The capstone of this research endeavor was to explore parent viewpoints about the program experiences that encouraged and supported their participation in a federally funded college-preparatory program. Specifically, this study helped to uncover what parents perceived as program elements that encouraged and supported their participation, as they engaged in the college preparation of their child. Study results provided necessary insight about what parents identified as relevant and culturally sensitive to the needs of their family as they navigated the

college-going process. The study results had direct implications for improved parent program models, program structure, and program activities that focused on college-preparation for first generation students that are from low-income backgrounds.

The results of this study will also increase understanding of and inform policy about practices that effectively engage parents in the college-going process in a federally funded program. Although this study will sample parents within the TRIO community who the study will have implications for pre-college programs that focus on increasing postsecondary access for the students who come from low-income backgrounds and are, the first to pursue higher education within their families. Also, this study will be useful to policy makers, educational leaders, and federal pre-college personnel who seek to improve college readiness, and increase postsecondary enrollment and completion through effective parent involvement.

Definition of Terms

In order to increase parental involvement in the college-going process, it is important to establish a college-going culture (Engle & Tinto, 2008). A college-going culture exists when high expectations, college talk, career exploration, information and resources, family involvement, faculty and staff involvement, college partnerships, s strong focus on academics and rigorous curriculum and a seamless message where the college message is communicated from pre-kindergarten through 12th grade are present (Los Angeles Unified School District, 2006). For this study, the college-going process refers to the postsecondary planning which results in postsecondary enrollment for program participants within one year of high school completion that operates within the college-going culture.

Early Intervention refers to strategies intended to prepare students for college in the middle school grades in order to accelerate from basic education courses into more rigorous courses. The strategies include, but are not limited to, counseling, course selection assistance, mentoring, parent/family involvement, and tutoring. (U.S. Department of Education, 2013).

Parental Self-Efficacy refers to a parents' sense of being capable of helping their child through the college going process and that there is value derived from their help (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997).

Parent and caregiver, for the purpose of this study, will be used interchangeably referring to the child's parent, other family members or guardians (McKenna & Millen, 2013).

Parent involvement and parent engagement, although often used interchangeably in the literature, are conceptualized as part of a continuum of stages of parent participation in the education of their children (Goodall & Montgomery, 2013). Parent involvement focuses on parents volunteering with school classroom activities, fundraising and support based on what plans and the goals school has determined on their own. With involvement, schools tend to lead with their mouth - generally telling parents what they should be doing. In contrast, parent engagement has schools leading with their ears. By listening to parents' ideas, and by eliciting from them what they have found works best with their children, a more genuine partnership can strengthen the family/school relationship (Ferlazzo, 2012).

Postsecondary Readiness refers to a process of high school students having completed the requisite college preparatory coursework; having knowledge of the financial aid, scholarship application and college application processes; having adequate preparation for college entrance

examinations, as well as an understanding of the challenges of college life and how to identify and utilize available resources on college campuses (Desimone, 1999; Feldman & Yershalmi, 1998; Gutman & Midgley, 2000).

Social capital enables students to gain access to other forms of capital such as, human and cultural, in an effort to gain resources and support for college planning and for use while in college (Coleman, 1988; Stanton-Salazar & Dornbush, 1995; Portes, 1998). Cultural Capital is a system of attributes that help define an individual's social class. Cultural capital includes language skills, cultural knowledge and mannerisms that are transmitted to individuals from one's family of origin (Bourdieu, 1986; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). Acquiring social and cultural capital provides necessary resources that will help students navigate the college-going process and experience postsecondary success (Engle and Tinto, 2008).

Description of Federal TRIO Programs

TRIO Programs are federally funded programs that were first legislated in 1964 to help families of low-income households and first generation students prepare for and graduate from college. (Council for Opportunity in Education, [COE] 2014a) The TRIO programs include Upward Bound which aims to help students from low-income households and first generation to college who are in grades 8-12 prepare for college; Educational Talent Search helps students in grades 6-12 prepare for college; Student Support Services (formerly called Special Services for Disadvantaged Students) was established in 1980; the Educational Opportunity Centers, legislated in 1972, serves as a pipeline to higher education for displaced workers, veterans and other nontraditional students, the Training Program for Federal TRIO programs was legislated in

1976 and in 1986 the Ronald E. McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement Program was designed to help students from underrepresented groups obtain doctorate degrees; the TRIO Math and Science program was designed to increase the number of students from low-income, first generation backgrounds to obtain degrees in the fields of Math and Science; and The Veteran's Upward Bound Program provides veterans an avenue to obtain college degrees (COE, 2014a).

TRIO pre-college programs consider the income and educational levels of parents as indicators of program eligibility as opposed to race or ethnicity. Participants in this study were predominantly Black, however, due to the racial make-up of the three schools from which students were recruited. The three public high schools are listed as low-performing schools and are located in high poverty neighborhoods within the school district. Therefore, the demographics that define this group of parent participants will include their race.

Summary

The chapter began with an introduction about the importance of parent/family involvement in the preparation of students for postsecondary study, and reported that the evidence of parent/family involvement in the college-going process has been historically low across the country in most federal precollege programs. The research question guiding the study was stated as, what do parents perceive are the program elements that encouraged and supported parent participation in the TRIO Program? An explanation of the utility and feasibility of using Q methodology to explore the perceptions, and values of parents embedded in the research question was presented. Finally, study results may impact practice and policy on both the local and federal fronts, lending significance to study.

Chapter 2 discusses of the relevant historical and seminal research related to parent involvement. Chapter 3 comprises an overview of the methodology and the research design used for the current study. I discuss the data and relevant findings from the study in Chapter 4. The final chapter includes of a summary of the study, a discussion of the major study implications, and recommendations for future research and practice.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

"If education continues to be out of reach for the poor we run the risk of perpetuating a debilitated workforce devoid of the skills and proficiencies necessary to operate globally" (Avshalom, Moffitt & Silva, 1998 p. 56). This quote crystallizes one segment of the education plight currently facing our country, lack of access to educational opportunities for our least advantaged citizens that provide preparation for postsecondary readiness leading to a postsecondary degree.

Former President Lyndon B. Johnson saw the problem of limited access to resources for the poor and underrepresented as a clarion call to launch his War on Poverty in the 1960's. Consequently, he signed into law the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965, which authorized the federal TRIO programs (COE, 2014c). This program was designed to increase the college enrollment and completion rate of high school students from low-income households, whose parents had not graduated with a baccalaureate degree. The federally funded TRIO Programs are the largest and oldest programs that provide support to the low-income, first generation student population. (Engle & Tinto, 2008) Yet with the comprehensive services provided to students by the TRIO Program, parent involvement continues to be low as reported by TRIO program directors (Swail & Perna, 2001). The challenge of low parent involvement is commonly reported by program directors in other federal pre-college programs across the country, such as GEAR-UP (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs) (Swail & Perna,

2001).

Every segment of our society is saddled with various facets of the same challenge: increasing high school graduation rates and rates of college enrollment and completion for the low-income, first generation student (Jeynes, 2011; Moles, 1982). For example, elected officials at every level are challenged with making sound decisions about educational policy, reform and funding to address issues related to postsecondary preparation and access. Employers are challenged with building a workforce that can respond to rapidly changing technology, needing employees to have the ability to act independently and think critically. School districts are challenged with high stakes testing and core standards in response to the National Goals outlined in the Educate America Act and No Child Left Behind (US Department of Education, 2002a). Addressing the challenges associated with the lack of postsecondary preparation is critical to producing a strong economy and preparing well-educated citizens that can meet rapidly changing workforce demands and realize a better quality of life for low-income American families (Brown, Rocha & Sharkey, 2005).

Postsecondary institutions are challenged with remediation issues, the education of non-traditional students and accommodating increasing numbers of diverse students (Brown, Rocha & Sharkey, 2005). Finally, families have the daily challenge of providing a support system that is conducive to learning. Providing such a system proves a formidable task for families from low-income, first generation households when their basic skills related to navigating the college going process are often very limited (Fann, McClafferty, & McDonough, 2009). Roberts (1992) further asserts that many families have a desire to help their children get to college, but lack the

necessary resources.

Students from impoverished backgrounds often face insurmountable educational, cultural, and social barriers, denying them access to the same educational opportunities as students from middle-income households (Jeynes, 2007; Kozol, 1991; Tierney, 2002). Low income, first generation students generally have limited access to postsecondary preparation and the resources that lead to postsecondary program completion. The challenges associated with poverty negatively affect our national economy, with implications for the delivery of social services.

Families from low-income households are more likely to experience violence, hunger, poor health, stress and abuse (The Children's Defense Fund, 1998). Such families are more likely to live in unsafe neighborhoods, go without recommended vaccinations, be unemployed, have a high incidence of students that drop out of high school, as well as, high rates of teenage pregnancy. Consequently, well-delivered parent programs, expressly designed to provide services to students, which can lead to a college degree, have implications for mitigating poverty.

Trend data on high school graduation rates, college preparation levels and college enrollment rates for low-income households are telling of the academic challenges that this population of students face. For example, the high school dropout rate remains five to six times as high as experienced among students from more affluent communities. This rate has remained constant for the past thirty years (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). According to the U.S. Department of Education (2012), almost 70 percent of high school students had aspirations of attending college after high school regardless of gender, race, ethnicity or class. Data comparing

the educational aspirations of high school seniors according to parents' level of education sheds further light on disparities.

For example, seventy-eight percent (78%) of high school seniors whose parents had a graduate or professional degree "definitely" had plans to graduate from college, whereas forty six percent (46%) of students whose parents had a high school diploma or less had "definite" plans to graduate from college (NCES, 2012). Many students who are from low-income, first generation households continue to be unprepared for and underrepresented in four-year colleges and universities (McDonough, 1997). Such students from low-income households tend to have parents who have not earned college degrees and generally live in communities where there are few role models for college completion. Thus, students from these communities may rely heavily on their school counselors for college information and guidance on navigating the college-going process (Choy, Horn, Nunez & Chen, 2000). With limited ability to access resources from their families and communities they turn to their schools to access the social capital for college planning (Noeth & Wimberly, 2002).

Although parents with low-income have dreams of their children going to college, the dream is often not realized, partly because these parents are much less knowledgeable about the process necessary to adequately prepare their child for college. This is especially true if the parent has not obtained a college degree (Roberts, 1992). Furthermore, students from low-income and first generation backgrounds are less likely to be enrolled in rigorous courses or even placed on a college preparatory track that will make them competitive in college admissions (Adelman, 2006). The schools that they attend are less likely to provide the students with

sufficient opportunities to make connections with school staff that are responsible for college planning (McDonough, 2004, Wimberly & Noeth, 2004).

The risk factors associated with being from low-income, first-generation households may have a critical effect on how these students fare once they get into college, compared with their peers from more affluent households. In a report conducted by the Pell Institute entitled, *Moving Beyond Access: College Success for Low-Income, First-Generation Students*, the current status of low-income, first-generation college students' in higher education was examined using data from the U.S. Department of Education datasets. According to the report, low-income, first-generation students were almost four times more likely to leave higher education after their first year than with students who did not have these risk factors. After six years, eleven percent of low-income, first-generation students had earned their four-year degree compared to fifty-five percent of their more advantaged peers (Engle & Tinto, 2008).

Need for the Study

The low rate of parents' participation in school activities at the high school level has proven to be a challenge and barrier to college preparation and school success for students from low-income communities (Gladieux & Swail, 2000). Although there exists much evidence that students fare better academically when parents are involved (Catsambis & Garland, 1997 Epstein, 1987; Fan & Chen, 2001), less light has been shed on what aspects of parent involvement are most effective in navigating the college-going process.

Educational research continues to substantiate the influence of parent involvement, particularly for students from low-income, first-generation households (Desimone, 2001; Eccles

& Harold, 1993; Jeynes, 2005a). Although parent involvement in some federal pre-college programs is mandated (Perna, 2002), there continues to be superficial and minimal parent participation within these programs (Tierney, 2002). The lack of parent participation is particularly the case in schools were poverty runs rampant (Kozol, 1997). Thus, there remains a need to develop programs to increase parent involvement (Tierney 2002).

Parent involvement has been correlated positively with student achievement and outcomes (Feldman & Yerushalmi, 1998; Gorman, 1998; Luster & McAdoo, 1996). Also linked with increased student achievement are parent involvement (Baumrind, 1974; Clark, 1983) and certain parent practices such as: high parent expectations and aspirations (Astone & McLanahan, 1991) open communication with children (Comer, 1980); participation in school events and activities (Comer, 1980; Stevenson & Baker, 1987) and strong parent networks (Coleman, 1988).

A limitation of parent involvement research is the focus on parenting practices of middle class families. Although educational research supports the positive impact of parent involvement on student achievement (Baker, 1996; Henderson & Berla, 1994; Thorkildsen & Stein, 1989 (U.S. Department of Education, 1994) there is not an established understanding about what specific types of parent involvement practices are associated with positive outcomes for low-income, first-generation communities at the high school level in pre-college programs. Subsequently, there remains a need to explore how income factors into student achievement and parent involvement.

Parent Involvement

Parent involvement has been widely held as a means of helping to increase student

achievement (Benner & Mistry, 2007; Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Seyfried & Chung, 2002; Zhan, 2006). Perhaps it can be called the missing link for helping to increase college readiness, access and completion. Therefore, it is critical to discuss parent involvement as an integral part of the reform effort for college access, achievement and degree attainment. To that end, we must identify a common set of practices that parents perceive to be encouraging and supporting in the college preparation of their child.

More than three decades of educational research informs current theory and practices related to the impact of parent and family involvement on the academic success of students from pre-school through high school (Bempechat, 1992; Berla & Henderson, 1994; Comer, 1980; Epstein, 1987; Jeynes, 2005, 2007; Schweinhart, Barnes, & Weikart; 1993; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbush & Darling, 1987). Such research substantiates the importance of parent involvement in schooling from increasing school productivity and the academic performance of socially disadvantaged groups (Henderson & Berla, 1994; U.S. Department of Education, 1994). Parent involvement is generally considered a necessary factor for increasing school productivity, countering the possible failures of disadvantaged groups, and achieving economic success for both the individual and the nation (Jeynes, 2010; Tierney, 2004).

Investigations into parent involvement have resulted in conceptual frameworks, typologies and models for parent and family involvement, (Alldred & Edwards, 2000; Comer, 1980; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997; McCurdy & Daro, 2001; Reed Jones, Walker & Hoover-Dempsey, 2000) processes that help educators understand the importance and impact of parent involvement (Henderson & Berla, 1994; Gutman & Midgley, 2000; U.S. Department of

Education, 1994) and parent partnerships with schools and communities (Epstein, 1987). Research about how parent demographics impact parent involvement (Desimone, 1999) specific types of parent involvement that impact academic achievement (Edwards & Warin, 1999; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995; Zellman & Waterman, 1998) and parent perceptions about parent involvement and educational levels at which parent involvement is most prevalent (Catsambis and Garland, 1997) have all helped to provide a deeper understanding of how to affect educational outcomes through parent involvement in general. However, the previously mentioned research fails to provide insight related to parent involvement in the college preparation of their child.

Parent Involvement and Student Achievement

Although parent involvement research pre-dates compensatory education programs such as the federally funded Head Start Program, designed to ensure that pre-school students from low-income families were ready to start first grade, it was not until the 1970's that parent involvement research gained momentum in validating the impact and benefit of parent involvement on learning and educational outcomes. Bronfenbrenner (1974) produced seminal research about the impact of parent involvement on a child's learning. In a longitudinal study, several early intervention projects targeting disadvantaged preschoolers and their families where analyzed. Bronfenbrenner concluded that children made higher and more durable gains when their mothers were integrally and actively involved in the children's learning. The most notable gains where realized when tutors in a two-year project visited homes twice weekly and introduced manipulatives, such as toy kits, to both the mother and the child. Bronfenbrenners'

work has implications for the current research because he has referred to the kind of involvement that involves parents and children in project-based experiences. Examples of involvement with kits or manipulative on the secondary level include the parent and child completing college applications, financial aid forms, and scholarship applications together which may increase college preparedness.

Barth (1979) reviewed several studies about teacher-parent collaborations that reinforce children's positive school behavior at home in an effort to improve academic performance. Among the strategies that were studied include sending messages and notes home, withholding privileges or allowances, and positive rewards. The researchers concluded that all of these strategies produced a beneficial effect on academic and improvement behavior. The Barth (1979) study relates to the current study because part of the college-going process includes communication between students, program staff and teachers and effective incentive programs to help students remain focused toward the goal of college enrollment. In the current study, parents will express the value of communication and reward in helping to motivate their participation in the college-going process.

Gordon (1977) reviewed parent involvement research, considering several parent involvement models: the Parent Impact Model, which focused on a parent's impact on the child's learning behavior; the School Impact Model, which discussed a parent's involvement in the school as volunteer or member of a school improvement committee; and the Community Impact Model, which addressed the influences of home, family, and community on the education of the child. He concluded that more comprehensive and lasting the parent involvement, the more

effective the outcomes are likely to be. He further asserted that not only would the effect be evident on student achievement but parent involvement would also improve school quality. The Gordon study relates to the current study in that each of his Models; Parent, School, and Community Impact, plays a part in the student experience from grade 9-12, or when a child begins their participation in the TRIO Program. I am hopeful that the research effort will yield parent responses that reflect the value and importance of a holistic experience that motivates parent involvement and student success.

The Perry High Scope Preschool Study (Schweikart, Barnes, Weikart, 1993) conducted in the 1960's with children and parents from impoverished backgrounds indicated that after 27 years, program participants were faring better than those who did not participate in the pre-school program. Study participants graduated high school, attended college, and obtained higher paying jobs than those who had not participated in the study.

Henderson (1981) reviewed studies on different aspects of parent involvement relating to student achievement. Of the studies that were under review, about fifty percent of them dealt with parent interaction with their children as a key variable in student success. The other half dealt with home-school relationship and programs that were making strides toward strengthening this relationship. The review of current parent involvement studies echoes early and seminal research on parent involvement: parents who are engaged in children's schooling were, and continue to be, instrumental to the academic success of their children. Henderson (1987) helped to further research on parent involvement and asserted that when parents are involved in the education of their children, student achievement is improved; children do better in schools and

tend to attend better schools.

Upon reviewing and assessing many studies on parent involvement, Moles (1982) highlighted key factors related to parent involvement. Moles' review supported that educational stakeholders such as teachers, parents, policymakers and students are interested in improving parent involvement. Also, educators must reexamine prevailing, and often deficit-oriented, beliefs about parents, their capabilities and interests related to their children's schooling processes. Furthermore, interest in parent participation should extend beyond the early elementary grades, up through middle and high school. As a result of this review, Moles suggested the following practices as most effective in parent involvement programs: teachers and parents working together in the design and development of the program, personal contact between family and school, and commitment on the part of teachers, schools and school system.

Becher (1984) discussed how parents can be effectively trained to improve their student's academic achievement and cites key family processes that are positively related to student achievement. She cites high expectations, frequent interaction, reinforcement of subject matter learned at school, improved communication between parent and child, and the parent serving as a model of learning and achievement.

Walberg (1984) reviewed 29 controlled studies on school-parent programs. He concluded that family participation in education was twice as predictive of academic learning as family socioeconomic status. Walberg further concluded that some of the programs he studied yielded effects 10 times as large as socioeconomic status and served as a vehicle to provide unexpected benefits both to older and younger members of the family. For example, as a result

of parent involvement, a family member may be inclined to complete requirements of a once thwarted high school or college diploma. Walberg concluded that parent-school partnership programs designed to improve academic conditions in the home have been successful in promoting student achievement.

Family Characteristics Related to Parent Involvement

Understanding the impact of family characteristics on the degree of parent and family involvement in children's educational attainment is important in developing relevant strategies for improved parent and family involvement. Examining influences of family attitudes and practices toward education of the previous generation, the family structure (single parent, grandparent or other family member as primary care-giver) level of education and the effects of disruptions and dislocations such as divorce, relocation, health issues or death, have direct influence on the ability of parents and family members to be involved in their children's educational pursuits.

Dauber and Epstein (1989), found that the better educated parents are, the more involved they are in both the school and the home environment than less educated parents; parents with fewer children were more involved at home; and employed parents were less likely to be involved at school but were equally involved at home. McNeal (2001) concluded in a study using the NELS 88 data that no matter what the family characteristics, parent participation mostly affected the behavioral aspect of a child's education rather than the cognitive. McNeal's (2001) work suggests that the active involvement of parents in their child's academic pursuits can have a dramatic effect on teaching and reinforcing student behaviors leading to academic

success. This concept is illustrated in the difference between teaching the content of the SAT exam (cognitive) and the strategies involved in earning a high score on that exam (behavior).

Parent Involvement Models and Strategies

One of the foremost commentaries on the state of parent involvement and the subsequent need for increased involvement was the Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 2000 (U. S. Dept. of Education, 2000) that was passed in 1994 by former President Bill Clinton. Goal number eight of The National Educational Goals, included in this act dealt specifically with parent participation. The goal was to "promote partnerships that would increase parent involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional and academic growth of children". Title IV of this act called for parent information and resource centers in schools to help increase parent involvement.

Current research on parent involvement has led to the development of models and strategies designed to facilitate parent involvement in the educational development of children. For example, Epstein (1995) categorizes parent involvement in six forms: "parenting" (creating environments in the home to promote education), "communicating" (attending parent teacher conferences), "volunteering" (chaperoning for a field trip), "learning at home" (helping your child with homework), "decision making" (becoming a member of the PTA or the school advisory council), or "involvement with the community" (influence other members of the community on education issues). The combination of the six forms of parent involvement, provide a solid framework for parents to facilitate student success.

Other models explain conditions under which parents participate in their child's education. Several models identify indicators of parent involvement, such as social and

psychological resources available to parents (Coleman, 1988) parents efficacy beliefs (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997) parent perceptions of their child (Epstein, 1991) parent assumptions about their role in their child's education (Eccles & Harold, 1991; Hoover-Dempsey, Basslet & Brissie, 1987) parent attitudes towards school, cultural, religious and ethnic identities of parents, parents socialization process and parent history of involvement in their child's education. Each of these models has provided guidelines, interventions, and other strategies to increase learning gains for all students. However, few models focus on the hard to reach low-income, first-generation college-bound population.

Parent models that focus on changing the parent and the family seem to take the deficit model, explaining what parents are missing. However, Raffaele and Knoff (1999) contend that strategic planning and organizational change is critical to the widespread problem and suggested models lack the necessary component of family involvement. Instead of faulting parents, the organizational climate must be examined within schools. For example, what messages are parents from low-income backgrounds receiving from teachers, principals, and other school administrators? These messages, whether overt or covert, may be barriers to parent involvement.

Tierney (2002) asserts that there is a great disconnect between the research supporting the claim that parent/family involvement raises the chances of a low-income student gaining entrance to college and the actual practice of family participation in college preparation programs. This study aims to give more insight into what actual parent activities, and attitudes will help establish tighter praxis. Bridging the chasm between research and what parents of low-income, first-generation students really perceive as valuable in helping their child get to college, will help to establish better guidelines for future pre-college program goals and objectives involving parents.

Barriers to Parent Involvement

Students that are from low-income, first generation backgrounds face many barriers when pursuing a college degree. Among the many barriers these students face are lack of knowledge and information, and the social capital to understand the academic requirements and the college application process that is foundational to the planning and pursuit of a postsecondary education (Nougera, 2001; Wimberly & Noeth, 2004). Such students are less likely than their more affluent counterparts to enroll in rigorous high school courses, including advanced math; less exposed to information and counseling about the gateway courses that are necessary before they enroll in high school, and may lack a culture of college going while in high school (Engle & Tinto, 2008).

Further research cites other characteristics of this student population compared to their more affluent peers (Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak, & Terenzini, 2004). According to the study, low-income, first-generation students lack adequate knowledge about the college-going process, have less family income and family support, and lack expectations and plans for college (Engle and Tinto, 2008) and are not adequately prepared for postsecondary study. In addition, these students' transition from high school to college is difficult because along with the anxieties and other difficulties of any college student, they also face cultural, social and academic transitions (Pascarella et al., 2004).

Home-school communication barriers. Barriers to the involvement of parents in the educative process of their children come in several forms. Researchers have attempted to explain this phenomenon by citing many barriers to parent involvement such as lack of time, energy, economic resources, familiarity with the curriculum, and confidence in one's ability to help (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler 1997), attitude about family roles, prior negative school

experiences, and attitudes of teachers regarding poor families. Some teacher attitudes may be a severe impediment to parent involvement for low-income students. Teachers tended to perceive a lack of parent involvement by parents from low-income communities as disinterest or unconcern and subsequently practice active discouragement (Epstein & Dauber, 1991; Hoover-Dempsey, Basslet, & Brissie, 1987).

In a two-year study on home and school influences on literacy achievement and low-income students (Snow, Barnes, Chandler, Goodman, & Hemphil, 1991) found that the variable most positively correlated with literacy skills was formal participation in school activities, serving on the PTA and volunteering. The study concluded that teacher-initiated requests for participation yielded greater involvement. This finding suggests that educational leaders should focus on ways to increase communication with parents leading to increased participation.

Pianta & Walsh (1991) reported that understanding the discontinuity between family and schools with regard to values about education, communication, and how support is given is important. If not fully understood, this discontinuity can serve as a risk factor for students. Several researchers have cited characteristics of the family's community, such as social disorganization, lack of social networking, presence of undesirable and dangerous opportunities and the lack of resources and opportunities, serve as barriers to effective parent involvement (Coleman, 1966; Eccles & McCarthy, 1993; Majoribanks, 2003).

Social capital barriers. Bourdieu (1976) asserts that all groups and people possess human capital. Unfortunately, human capital is viewed differently based on who is assessing it. Since most educators' perception of human capital is determined by their own middle-class experiences and values, this marginalizes the human capital of the working class. This social reality makes it difficult for the working-class to activate their capital in environments outside of

their families and neighborhoods (Vitti, 1999). Social capital is a type of human capital and the Social Capital theory provides a deeper understanding of barriers that prevent poor parents from fully participating in programs designed to increase student success. Researchers characterize parent involvement as a form of social capital that has potential to increase college enrollment (McDonough, 1997, Perna & Titus, 2005, Lareau, 1987, 2000). The work of Bourdieu (1986), Coleman (1998), and Lin (2000) identify parent involvement as a type of social capital that provides access to necessary resources that facilitate college enrollment.

Parent involvement is an important element in building social capital that helps to communicate the norms, trust, authority and the social controls that are critical for educational attainment (Rowan-Kenyon, Bell, & Perna, 2008; Coleman, 1988). To illustrate this point, Rowan-Kenyon et al (2008) conducted descriptive case studies of 15 high schools that represent various, economic, demographic and educational characteristics. The research focused on how parent involvement and its' interaction with contextual conditions influence college opportunity. They found that parents shape college opportunity for their child but there were differences related to socioeconomic status.

Additionally, Rowan-Kenyon et al (2008) reported that school context helps to shape parent involvement and is also shaped by parent involvement. Finally, the study revealed that the higher education context as well as the social, economic and policy context, have bearing on how parents decide to involve themselves in the college-going process. As parents actively engage, they are introduced to the various contexts that shape their participation. As understanding increases they position themselves to gain the social capital necessary for their child to get into college and experience success.

Bourdieu's concept of social capital is "the sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that

accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition" (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992 p 119). Further illustrating Bourdieu's concept, McDonough (1997) revealed that students from families with high socioeconomic status have the most valued forms of social and cultural capital and these resources are used to maintain their social class standing. These parents transmit their knowledge and experiences associated with the college-going process to their children as they begin planning for college.

School level barriers. The lack of social and cultural capital can be a formidable barrier to parent participation. Epstein (1986) contends however, that the most important barrier to parent involvement is school practices. The status variables including race, parent education, family size, marital status and grade level are much less important than school practices in determining whether parents will continue to be a part of their children's education. The findings in Martin's study (2009) of 10 Title 1 schools in grades k-6, also confirm that school practices are a critical part of a parents decision to participate. A key finding of this research was that "when practitioners work in isolation from their students' families, parent involvement declines to the detriment of student success (Martin 2009, p. 17). Conversely, when practitioners work to include parents as equal partners in education with clear objectives for learning and development, parents increase involvement in ways that benefit children (Martin 2009).

School practices are very much a part of the context of the school that are linked to social, political, and economic contexts as outlined by Rowan-Kenyon et al, (2008). This finding is in keeping with the tenants of the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Model (1997) which purports that school practices affect parent role construction, parent self-efficacy, and the parents' sense that they are wanted or valued as part of the educative process.

In a perfect world, we could say that all parents have an abiding interest, and take an active role in their children's education. However, there are broad variations across demographic categories, most notably, socioeconomic status. Studies have shown that parent involvement patterns are influenced by parent social, racial-ethnic and economic characteristics (Catsambis & Garland, 1997; Hoover-Dempsey, Basslet, & Brissie, 1987). The findings, however, are inconclusive. Several studies cited that poor minority parents have a divergent belief system about parent role in school involvement and tend to be less involved in school activities than higher income parents (Chavkin & Williams, 1993; Coleman, 1987b; Delgado-Gaitan, 1999; Lareau, 1987). Conversely, other studies have shown that the level of parent involvement for the poor differs for only a few types of involvement. In some areas, poor parents had higher levels of involvement than their more affluent counterparts (Catsambis & Garland, 1997; Keith, 1993; Sui-Chu & Williams, 1996).

Studies that factor in the effect of different types of involvement across race and income lines are scarce and must be addressed further in the research if parent involvement is to be used as a mechanism to improve educational opportunities and outcomes for students (Desimone, 1999). Based on these studies, specific parent behaviors were involved in helping students to overcome demographic barriers that hinder low-achieving students with like demographic characteristics.

The motivations driving parent interest and involvement are multivariate in nature and scope, with the range extending from the desire that their children succeed to parents wanting to know what they must do specifically to help their child succeed. Parents have stated consistently

that they want to be more involved in their children's education and would welcome information on how to help the school meet its goal (Comer, 1980; Dauber & Epstein, 1989; Dornbush & Ritter, 1988). Studies also reveal that parents think collaborative involvement in a child's education is important (Eccles & Harold, 1993). Furthermore, when parents feel that schools are making an effort to involve them, they become more involved (Dauber & Epstein, 1989).

High Achieving, Low-income Students

There is much to be said about the many students of low-income status who are achieving despite seemingly insurmountable barriers. Researchers have cited two elements of parent involvement that are critical to student success, academic support and motivational support (Bempechat, 1998). Hilton and Derochers (1989) studied factors that predicted persistence in science among high achieving minority students. Their work revealed that students who have access to advanced classes and participated in math clubs and other academic teams were strongly associated with high achievement, and continued to persist in science related activities. The subjects of the Hilton & Derochers (1989) study were exposed to more educational resources whereas, the students that achieved against all odds in Bempechat's study (1998) had access to a limited amount of educational resources.

Bloir (1997), studied a group of high achieving African-American students that were of low-income status to discover what type of parenting styles promoted their success of the two styles mentioned; authoritative and authoritarian. These scholars reported their parents as being highly engaged, involved, communicative, with high levels of warmth and support and low levels of promoting autonomous decision-making.

Predictors of College-Going Behavior

Several studies (Adelman, 1999; Cabrera & La Nasa, 2000; McDonough, 1997) have shown the following elements to be the strongest predictors of college attendance and college completion, especially for low-income students: academic preparation, social support, access to information, parent involvement and knowledge about college and financial aid. Adelman (1999) found that rates of college completion were greater when students took academically rigorous coursework in high school such as advanced placement courses and math above Algebra 2. In conjunction with increased rigor, students must have social systems to help them understand the college-going process, which may be more challenging to transmit from parents who lack the experiences related to navigating college-going process (Martinez & Klopott, 2005; Noguera, 2001).

Students need strong social networks that will help support their academic and emotional development (Martinez & Klopott, 2005) that included parents who have high expectations and provide educational and financial support (Trusty, 2001). Students must have access to the information that will help them in the college planning process and information about which courses to take throughout high school, as well as information about financial aid (McDonough, 1997). The efforts of the federal TRIO Program provides the academic guidance and emotional support; help with college preparatory course selection, information about and assistance with applications to college, scholarships, and federal financial aid. Each of these offerings is critical to the college-going process.

TRIO Programs: A Federal Response

Since this study will be conducted within the context of the federal TRIO Program it will be informative to begin by describing the program, its' mission and its' methods in helping to prepare low-income, first generation students prepare for postsecondary enrollment. There are over 967 TRIO Upward Bound Programs in the United States that provide supplemental education, academic counseling, cultural and social exposure, in a year round format. They are housed primarily at postsecondary institutions with some non-profit agencies operating programs. The program philosophy is to provide students from low-income, first generation backgrounds academic support, cultural and social exposure and helps students to overcome barriers that are associated with class (COE, 2014a).

Each program operates differently but the common thread between all programs is that they provide regular classes for students in Math from Algebra to Calculus, English with a focus on composition and literature, science from Biology to Physics and Foreign Language. The program operates year round with a six-week summer component where students reside on college campuses operating as college students. Students are selected from target schools that are identified as having high needs such as a significant percentage of students on free and reduced lunch, persistently low performing school, and schools with large populations of English speakers of other languages (COE, 2014a).

Students are recruited as rising tenth graders in order to spend three summer's preparing for college. Prospective students receive applications through their school guidance offices or through teachers. Program staff is largely from backgrounds that are similar to the low-income, first generation student, providing a frame of reference for extending an empathetic perspective. A major requirement for funding consideration is the program's ability to hire staff that have

overcome barriers similar to the ones that the students they serve are facing (34 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 645).

Although parents are strongly encouraged to participate in training sessions, orientations, and program activities, it is not required as part of the federal guidelines for the grant. Some programs, however, have made parent involvement more central to program success, by having parents sign contracts committing to participation as a condition of the students' acceptance to the program. This program did not enforce a contract.

Support for the Need of the Study

Parent involvement is essential to increasing postsecondary readiness and college enrollment rates of low-income, first generation students who participate in federal pre-college programs. When parents have high educational expectations for their children and are involved the educational process, student achievement is increased (Henderson, 1981, 1987; Henderson and Berla, 1994; Olmstead and Rubin, 1982 & Walberg, 1984). It is of great importance to gain insight through the parent voice. Parent responses about techniques, strategies, and experiences that were most valuable to them in helping their children prepare for postsecondary education shows promise in redefining parent programs that facilitate student success.

The parent involvement construct is complex and multi-faceted. The research base is expansive and constantly growing. In an effort to synthesize this body of literature into thoughtful and meaningful review, I have chosen to present the research on parent involvement in segments based on the themes that have emerged from the review of the research. This review will cover current research on parent involvement in middle and high school, parent involvement related to student achievement, types of family involvement that affect student achievement, parent involvement related to demographic characteristics, policy issues related to parent

involvement, parent involvement models, and suggestions for future research in the area of parent involvement.

Studies show that parent involvement tends to decrease when students proceed to high school. Based on data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988, Catsambis and Garland (1997), found that high school parents monitor student's individual behavior less and become more focused on what educational programs the school can provide. The study revealed that by eighth grade, most parents had hopes of postsecondary education for their child but few had taken the necessary steps to assure proper academic alignment or secure money for college. A high number of 12th grade parents expected to fund the college education through grants and scholarships, but fewer had applied for financial aid before high school graduation. Findings also indicated that many parents would welcome the opportunity for communication with schools. They would also benefit from guidance in securing funds for postsecondary education.

As students transition from middle to high school, monitoring teen involvement and social life; providing homework assistance and participating directly in school activities become very effective types of parent involvement (Falbo, Lein, and Armador, 2001). Therefore, exploring and discussing parent values and beliefs about postsecondary education and activities associated with improving the chances of their children getting to college, is of major importance.

Support for the Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study hinges primarily on the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Model of Parent Involvement (1997). The Social Capital Theory has been utilized to help explain the nature of low-income, first generation families as related to parent involvement and the lack of resources available as their children prepare for college. The Hoover-Dempsey

and Sandler Model of Parent Involvement (1997) suggests that a parent who has not attended college is less likely to participate in the college-going process because "they do not perceive such activities to be consistent with their view of appropriate behaviors" (Rowan-Kenyon; Bell & Perna, 2008, pp 567) which is directly reflective of parent role construction. The second factor is parent self efficacy where a parent believes that their presence or assistance will not have a significant effect on their child's college outcome and finally, parents perceive that they there involvement is not needed or wanted at the school level (Kenyon-Rowan, Bell & Perna, 2008). Using the constructs of the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Model (1997) as well as research on how parent involvement and social capital effect motivation for involvement, I will explore parent perceptions about the postsecondary preparation of their children and for themselves and use this valuable data to augment and fortify existing practices that will be effective, and meaningful, having the potential to increase postsecondary preparation access and success for low-income, first-generation students.

Social capital (Coleman, 1998) refers to a network of social structures and social relations that facilitate the acquisition of desired services. Without social capital there are no resources with which to navigate social, political, or educational systems to your benefit. Many low-income parents lack the social network and resources to begin preparing their child for college. For example, some poor families feel they should leave academic matters to teachers and are often intimidated by the teachers professional authority and they shy away from teaching their children for fear that they are wrong (Lareau, 2000).

The Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Model of Parent Involvement (1997) as well as the Social Capital Theory (Coleman, 1988) will provide a framework to elucidate motivational factors of parent involvement in postsecondary preparation, and provide a basis for the

identification of specific experiences and activities that encourage and support effective parent involvement models focusing specifically on the understanding of the college-going process.

Summary of Literature Review

The research literature on parent/family involvement encompasses findings that reinforce the academic impact of parent involvement. Other studies to the contrary contend that these may even be an inverse relation between parent involvement and academic achievement. Nevertheless, the federal government through goal eight of the Educate America Act (U.S Department of Education, 2000) was basing part of this reform effort on the benefits of parent involvement in improving academic achievement.

Throughout the relevant research a great deal of study of parent and family involvement has been at the middle school level. Although many studies have focused on the impact of parent involvement on low-income minority students, little research has focused on low-income, minority high schools in college preparation programs. Research dealing with parent voice regarding college preparatory strategies and involvement in the college going process is sparse, therefore, creating a void in the literature that limits our understanding, as educators, about what parents need to feel more empowered in the college-going process of their children. Much of the research focused on identifying specific parent involvement strategies that factor certain kinds of parent involvement.

This study will explore parent perceptions about what experiences were most valuable to them in the college preparation of their child, with the federal TRIO Program and identify specific strategies that will increase and enhance parent involvement in the college-going process in all programs that provide pre-college services for low-income, first generation students

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to explore parent perceptions about specific postsecondary preparation program elements that most encouraged and supported parent involvement. The results of the study will inform current parent involvement practices about parent values and perceptions that will perhaps guide educational leaders in the development of more effective parent involvement program components. Study findings will lead to new and expanded strategies to enhance the quality of parent involvement in college preparatory programs, ultimately leading to increased college preparation, college enrollment and college completion. This chapter outlines and discusses the research question concerning parent perceptions about elements that most encouraged and supported their involvement in postsecondary preparation programs, the methodological approach, the research design, a description of the study participants, procedures for data collection, and data analysis.

Since this study involves the exploration and discovery of attitudes and perceptions of parents, and is self-referent in nature, Q methodology was employed. Q methodology allows participants to ascribe meaning to the data and establishes a more proximal relationship between the researcher and the participant, thus "loads the dice in favor of participant subjectivity" (Brown, 2007 p. 25). Essentially, Q methodology examines response patterns across individual participants, rather than variables allowing the researcher to systematically identify groups with like perspectives (Watts & Stenner, 2012).

At the data collection stage of the research process, Q methodology enables a participant to represent his or her perspective in an effort to hold it constant for the purpose of examination

and comparison (Brown 2007). In Q methodological research the respondent represents his or her perspective on an issue of "subjective importance through the operational medium of a Q-sort" (McKeown & Thomas, 1988 p. 12). Q methodology is well-suited to identify patterns that represent shared parent perceptions on the elements that best encourage and support parent involvement in the college- going process. In order to do so, Q methodology utilizes both qualitative and quantitative, factor analytic techniques. For this study, Q Methodology was used to identify, describe, and compare and contrast, distinct perspectives that were shared by groups of parents of TRIO students regarding the elements that most supported and encouraged their involvement in the college preparation of their child.

The Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Model of Parent Involvement (1997) suggests that there are specific variables that influence parent involvement at critical points in the parent involvement process. The five levels of this model range from parents actually making a choice to participate (level one), to the influence of parent involvement on student outcome (level five). Since this study seeks to explore parents' perceptions about why they participate in the postsecondary preparation of their child, level one of the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Model (1997) will be utilized to inform the construction of the research instrument, called the Q sample, and to provide a theoretical frame to make meaning from the resultant data.

Q Methodology

Q methodology was initially developed and introduced in 1935, by William Stephenson. This methodology has been recognized for its ability to combine qualities of quantitative and qualitative research traditions into one methodology. The research will follow the systematic method for quantifying human subjectivity (McKeown & Thomas, 1998). In contrast to R methodology where the focus is on the researcher to extract, reduce, and explain data taken from

a select population; (Janson, 2007), Q methodology empowers participants to ascribe meaning to the data and establish a more proximal relationship to the research process, in contrast to R methodological research or survey research. Q methodology examines response patterns across individual participants, rather than variables allowing the researcher to systematically identify groups who share similar perspectives (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Given that the above explanation was an overview of Q Methodology, there are some distinct features that are typical to Q Methodology and warrant further explanation.

For example, Q Methodology employs a much smaller sample size than R Methodology because Q Methodology operates from the participant's perspective rather than the researcher's perspective and eliminates the need for a large sample size (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Another difference between Q and R Methodologies lies in the development of the research question. With R Methodology a concept is generally assumed to have an *a priori* meaning, whereas in Q Methodology, the research participants define the concept in relation to their own perspective. Another distinction is that R Methodology studies participants from the researcher (external) perspective, whereas Q Methodology studies from the participants (internal) perspective.

This internal focus influences how the Q sample is developed. The Q sample is the set of statements that participant's sort according to their point of view, and is drawn from the communication concourse. Brown stated,

> "The concourse is the very stuff of life, from the playful banter of lovers or chums to the heady discussions of philosophers and scientists to the private thoughts found in dreams and diaries. From concourse, new meanings arise, bright ideas are hatched, and discoveries are made: it is the wellspring of creativity and identity formation in

> individuals and it is Q Methodology's task to reveal the inherent structure of a concourse (1993, pp. 94-95)."

The communication concourse is the population of subjective statements contained in the opinion domain. The Q sample is a broad representative sample of the entire concourse (Watts & Stenner, 2005).

Each of the statements in the Q sample is printed on a card or represented electronically in similar fashion, and the set of cards is given to study participants with clear set of sorting instructions called the conditions of instruction (Watts & Stenner, 2005). The actual process of sorting the statements in the Q sample, called Q-sorting, involves participants sorting the cards into a quasi-normal distribution according to the instructions given to them.

One last distinction of Q Methodology involves the use of factor analysis. In Q Methodology, instead of the traditional by-variable approach to factor analysis, the model is inverted by using a by-person analysis. The variables are the participants that are engaging in the Q-sort process rather that the Q sample statements. As a result, the researcher can identify clusters of participants who represent a certain perspective, which departs form the theoretical frame of R Methodology. After the inverted factor analysis is considered, the procedures for analysis are in keeping with traditional methods.

Research Design

Q methodology provides a rarely seen "scientific focus on the subjective or the self-referential, allowing participants to project their feelings on a specific subject (Watts & Stenner, 2012 p. 45). Participants' perspectives about a specific subject or topic are studied in this research approach. A Q Methodology study generally occurs in two phases. The first phase involves the collection of data from participants around the topic at hand that eventually forms

the basis of the research instrument or Q sample. During the second phase participants express their perspectives around the topic by sorting the opinion statements that comprise the Q sample. The cards are sorted in a forced choice manner that resembles the quasi –normal distribution shape (Janson, 2007). Participants sort this Q sample of opinion statements into a forced distribution grid based upon how those statements align with their own perspectives. These individual Q-sorts are then correlated to each other, factor analyzed, and extracted and those extracted factors yield the diverse perspectives of the participants on the given subject. The factors represent shared views on a topic, as well as the strength of the relationships that exist among the individual Q-sorts within distinct emergent factors, or groupings of viewpoints, as well as the degree of relationship between the factors themselves (Janson 2007).

For this study, the first phase involved the development of a Q sample derived from the concourse of opinion statements representing participating parents perspectives regarding TRIO program elements that most encouraged and supported their participation. The opinion statements were derived from a parent survey and from statements from the professional literature on parent involvement including both empirical and conceptual studies about parent motivational factors, which enlists structured sampling with elements of both deductive and inductive design (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Deductive design is based on a priori theoretical considerations. Whereas, inductive design "emerges from the patterns that are observed as statements are collect (McKeown & Thomas, 1988 p. 29)

The initial statements were gathered from the open-ended question of a parent involvement survey, administered at the end of each academic program. From the anonymous parent survey forty (40) statements were gathered for use in developing the communication concourse. From the professional literature, nineteen (19) statements were selected. Forty (40)

parents were purposely selected from a group of sixty (60) parent participants in the parent group, whose child had graduated from high school and enrolled in a postsecondary program within one year of graduation.

Sixty parents were initially contacted via phone and email. Contact information was provided through the parent meeting sign-in sheets, obtained by the officers of the parent group. The initial contact took five to seven minutes of the parents' time during which I asked questions about the current status of their child, whether they had graduated or were still in school. The initial contact helped to assess the parents' willingness to participate in the study. After the initial contact was made, parents were sent via email, the informed consent form which described the purpose of the study, notified them of Institutional Review Board approval, described the methods that would maintain their confidentiality, and the use of their findings in publication through the dissertation process, professional journals, and conference presentations. The consent form also provided potential participants with my contact information, the contact information of my dissertation chair, and the UNF institutional research office; as well as assurances that the data will remain anonymous. Finally, this consent form also notified them that completion of the form signaled their involvement in the research process, which would then begin.

The opinion statements were gathered from the parent survey along with statements gathered from body of literature on parent involvement regarding program elements that were viewed by parents to be the most encouraging and supporting factors in their participation in this college preparatory program, employing the elements of deductive design. From this body of opinion statements or communication concourse, the 33-item Q sample was developed. During phase two, the Q sample was administered to TRIO program parents whose children were

enrolled in college within a year of high school graduation to sort within the forced distribution and also invited them to provide background demographic data as well as responses to open-ended questions pertaining to their decision-making process during the Q-sorts. These participant Q-sorts were then correlated, factor analyzed, and subjected to factor rotation and extraction using the PQMethod 2.11freeware (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2002).

The Communication Concourse

The communication concourse is the entire set or population of value statements gathered from parents related to their involvement experiences. Stephenson (1978) held that a communication concourse is composed of statements that represent "the flow of communicability surrounding any topic" (Brown, 1993, p.94). Q samples are derived from this communication concourse, and these Q samples represent a smaller, but representative sample of the broader concourse (Watts & Stenner, 2012).

This study's concourse was developed from two sources. The first source was derived from the open-ended question on the parent survey administered at the end of the program year. (Appendix G). The second source was the professional literature pertaining to parent involvement, structural models of parent involvement in schools, and socio-cultural aspects of parent involvement. The combination of these two sources comprised the communication concourse, or opinion domain for this study

Professional Literature

In addition to the 40 statements derived from the parent survey, nineteen statements were added to the concourse in an effort to provide the most comprehensive array of opinion statements regarding the elements that encouraged and supported parent involvement in postsecondary preparation programs. Concourse items derived from the professional literature

pertaining to parent involvement were selected based empirical and conceptual studies on the following constructs: communication, cultural and social capital, parent roles, parent self-efficacy, parent expectations, parent need to be included or invited to participate and establishing a college-going culture (Engel & Tinto, 2008).

Research regarding communication indicates that parents participate when school and program processes included communication with parents and regarding student progress including grades, and conduct (Comer, 1980; Beecher, 1984). Therefore, the statements added to the concourse surrounding the communication construct are as follows: I am more able to communicate with my child about school; I am more able to talk to my child's teacher about their progress.

The research on social and cultural capital reveals that parents participate when they have access to networks and resources that will help their children (Coleman, 1988; Comer, 1980; Rowan-Kenyon, 2008; and Pascarella, 2004). The added statements surrounding the social and cultural capital constructs are as follows: Program staff advised me on what college preparatory classes my child needed to take to have a better chance at college admission; I was able to contact program staff for help after my child graduated and on into college; program staff helped connect me with college officials that helped my child succeed in college; program staff helped my child apply for graduate school; and program staff provided access to college programs that helped her transition better.

The role that parents' perceive they play in their child's education is greatly influenced by their family of origin (Epstein, 1991; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997). Research reflects that parents participate more when members of their family of origin participated (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995). Concourse statements around the parent role construct include the

following: Program staff helped reinforce how critical my role as parent was in all aspects of the process, because my family only came to events when I was on "the program"; I participated, at first, because that's how my mother did it when I was growing up; I participated because my family never did and I have learned how important it is for parents to help out.

Many parents from low-income, first-generation families feel that they don't know enough to help their child in school (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995; McNeal 2001, Dauber & Epstein, 1989). The Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Model has shown that lack of parent self-efficacy is a major reason why parents choose not to become involved in the formal education of their child. (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler 1997, 2005) The following concourse statements were added to include options for increased parent self-efficacy as being an element that encouraged and supported participation in the program: Program activities like parent workshops, and parent leadership roles helped me to learn more about how to help my child; Teachers provided website information for homework help that made me feel better about helping my child in math and science; and teachers, staff and administrators worked together to help me feel secure in helping my child.

Parent expectations are said to be the greatest indicator of college success, regardless of socio-economic status or ethnicity. (Epstein 1991; Hossler & Stage, 1992; Trusty, 2001) Students are greatly influenced by what their parents expect of them. The concourse items that were added to include options supported by the parent expectation construct are as follows: I learned from staff and the other parents, that if I expect more from my child and give him help, he will do better; program staff helped my child raise his expectations of himself going to college.

The Snow et al. (1999) study indicated that teacher initiated requests to participate yield

greater parent involvement. Parallel to this study are the findings of the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Model (1997, 2005) purporting that rates of participation are high when parents are asked, invited or demanded to participate. The statements added to the concourse reflecting parent belief that invitations and requirements to come are elements that encouraged and supported their participation in the college preparatory program are as follows: The staff made sure we came to all the functions and it made me feel like I was necessary to the process; other parents were excited to participate which made me excited to participate.

Finally, Engle and Tinto (2008) researched college success indicators resulting from a college-going culture. The statements added to the concourse reflecting parent belief that being a part of a college-going culture encouraged and supported participation are as follows: Program activities like financial workshops and college prep course selection helped establish a college going culture; The network of parents helped strengthen the college going culture; The program helped our family change to a college-going culture which will benefit the rest of the kids in our family.

Parent Responses to Survey

The annual parent survey provided parent perspectives about program involvement. These perspectives were used to develop the communication concourse. The parents that participated in this component assisted the program in meeting its goals, engaging in activities related to advocacy, education geared toward graduation, mentoring and fundraising. The parent survey comprised several multiple choice questions regarding programming and one open-ended question that prompted parents to discuss elements that most encouraged and supported their involvement in the college preparation of their child in a federally funded pre-college program. A total of 19 concourse items were generated from the open-ended question during phase 1 of

this study.

Concourse Refinement

The process of developing the Q sample was conducted with a smaller sample of the target population resulting in the Q-set. The forty (40) collected parent responses to the open ended question and the nineteen (19) statements gleaned from the parent involvement literature were categorized by emergent themes yielding a communication concourse that represented current research as well as current parent values and perceptions identifying factors that encourage and support parent involvement in pre-college programs. After addressing a great deal of redundancy and repetition within the communication concourse, the Q sample was derived.

The items collected for the communication concourse were a comprehensive representation of parent viewpoints about what elements encouraged and supported their participation in the parent component of a college preparatory program. The strategies to reduce the concourse to the Q sample will be reviewed in the following section

Q Sample Refinement

McKeown and Thomas (1998) supported the use of unstructured or structured statements in the selection of the concourse items. Structured Q samples follow more systematic patterns following a theory, where the researcher gleans patterns from the statements, as they are collected. Unstructured samples are constructed "without undue effort made to ensure coverage of all possible sub-issues" (McKeown & Thomas, p. 28). Because of the expansive field of reasons a parent could choose as an element that encouraged and supported their participation in the college preparatory program, and in an effort to "cover all possible sub-issues", the current study employed the unstructured Q Sample.

The unstructured Q sample allowed the researcher to include all distinct thoughts and ideas that emerged for the literature on parent involvement and the participant interview responses. In an effort to keep the Q-sort manageable for study participants, eliminating ambiguity or confusion, the items were condensed (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Additionally, the researcher want to assure that the Q-sort did not take an inordinate amount of time to complete. The two abovementioned concerns led to the selection of a moderate number of opinion statements. Based upon these considerations, the researcher included 33 items in the Q sample, which will likely take about 45 minutes to complete. A review of the literature and open-ended responses for parent surveys produced 59 opinion items. To produce a manageable research instrument, not all possible statements composing the concourse could be represented in the Q sample. Therefore, the issue of how some statements were either included or excluded from the Q sample is important (McKeown & Thomas, 1988).

The process of sculpting a relevant and useful Q sample first involved the clarification of concourse statements, so the statements might be well understood by participants (Stainton-Rogers, 1991). The researcher reviewed the 59 concourse items in order to help ensure that each statement was understandable to potential participants and that these statements contained some degree of face validity in reference to the topic of parent involvement. The researcher collaborated with the dissertation co-advisors in order to clarify statements and to distill core meanings, re-phrase statements in the first person singular, and in some cases, to rephrase statements to reflect parent behavior regarding their participation in school programs. An example of this is the modification made to the statement "Other parents in the program encourage me to continue participating". This item was revised to read in the first person singular, and to reflect and convey a behavior ("demonstrate"), rather than a quality or state of

being (is"): "I participated because other parents in the program encouraged me to come". No reduction of concourse items occurred during this process.

For example, the researcher determined that the following statements were similar and could be combined: "Program staff was very supportive of our family", "The director was very involved in helping my child", and "Program staff always showed genuine concern for our entire family". These statements were combined as follows: "I was supported and encouraged to participate because of the care and concern of program staff for my family". The process of condensing items that shared similar content, led to the reduction of the concourse items to the 33-item Q sample.

Q Sample

In Q methodology, the research instrument or the Q sample, is derived from statements drawn from the concourse. So, the Q sample, according to McKeown & Thomas (1988) is a group of items that is given to the research participants so that they can rank order them based on their own viewpoint and perspective in a Q-sort. The Q sample is derived from the communication concourse of parent opinion items by refining the concourse in an intentional and relevant manner (Janson, 2007). Responses in a Q methodological study depend on the self-referent expressions of participants sorting the items. These responses comprise the Q sample. In order for the participants to complete the sorting process, the Q sample must contain a broad range of opinion possibilities about the topic being studied.

Participants

The participants in Q methodology are called the P set. Q methodology focuses intensively on a smaller sample of individuals in contrast to survey research that is representative of R methodology (in which tests or traits are correlated and factored). The emphasis on a

smaller sample of individuals is rooted in the methodological intent to explore individual participants' "internal frames of reference" (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 12). McKeown and Thomas (1988) suggested that a survey of around 50 people would be considered "extensive in Q" (p. 37).

Brown (1993) held that although Q methodology is not intended to produce broad generalizations regarding the relative representation of opinions and perspectives on a topic emerging from various categorical groups, the results of a Q methodology study are highly generalizable in terms of the overall range of opinions and perspectives elicited regarding a given topic. Therefore, it is desirable to elicit the widest range of expressed opinion statements in order to uncover the broadest possible span of perspectives on a topic. In keeping with this focus, care was taken to ensure that participants were represented by income level, level of education, and ethnicity. According to federal guidelines of eligibility two thirds of students served must be low-income and first-generation. One third of the students must be either low-income or first generation. All parent participants met the federal eligibility criteria. The host of the TRIO program was a small private institution in a large metropolitan city.

Forty parents, whose child had graduated from high school while participating in the TRIO program, were invited to participate in this study. Parents were chosen for the study if their child enrolled in a postsecondary program within one year after high school graduation. The preliminary parent data used in the solicitation process was gathered from past parent surveys and sign in documents from parent meetings, which contained parent contact information.

The demographic data for the 40 parent participants included 39 Black, and 1 White American, 36 female and 4 males, with ages ranging from 35 years to 72 years. The relationships to the child included mother, father, and grandmother. Thirty eight of the 40 parents

had not graduated from college, and 39 were eligible for free and reduced lunch indicating low-income status.

Q-sort Procedures

Q-sorts were performed by parents who participated in a federally funded TRIO program in Florida, whose child enrolled in a postsecondary program with one year of high school graduation. The parent participants met the eligibility guidelines for program participation because they were either of low-income status and had not obtained a four-year degree or they met both criteria and were low-income and had not obtained a four-year degree. Federal TRIO program guidelines state that two-thirds of program participants must be low-income AND first generation; one-third can be either low-income OR first generation.

The Q-sort was administered to parents in a face to face manner, at scheduled times and locations that were convenient for them. The 40 participants were given the Q-sort individually at their homes, or the public library in their neighborhood. The researcher, in a room that was quiet, containing adequate table space to complete the sorting process, administered the Q-sorts.

The researcher reviewed the participant invitation letter (Appendix C) describing the study that included the approval of the study by the University of North Florida Institutional Review Board for Approval to Use Human Research Participants (Appendix B). Demographic information was collected (Appendix G) and the 33 cards, each containing a statement from the Q sample, were then presented to the participants along with a Q-sort response grid that included written standardized sorting instructions (Appendix F). The sorting instructions were reviewed orally with the parents by the researcher.

During the direct administration of the Q-sorts, participants were given the 33 cards composing the Q sample and invited first to read through the cards in order to obtain an overall

impression of the contents of the entire Q sample. This initial read-through of the stimulus statements in the Q sample is helpful because participants may need time to adjust to the mental task of categorizing the items (Brown, 1993). To facilitate the categorization of the program elements, participants were invited to begin sorting the statements into three different piles based on their initial impressions as to whether the individual items were "least supported and encouraged your involvement in the college preparatory program", "most supported and encouraged parent involvement in the college preparatory program" or unsure.

Participants were instructed to place the "least supported and encouraged parent involvement in the college preparatory program" in a pile near the left of the continuum, the neutral items in the middle, and the "most supported and encouraged parent involvement in the college preparatory program " items to the right. A scale ranging from -4 to +4 was provided to aid participants in their sorting process as they began to make more specific decisions about how to categorize the stimulus items within the forced quasi-normal distribution. McKeown and Thomas (1988) stated that "the recommended quasi-normal distribution is merely a device for encouraging subjects to consider the items more systematically than they might otherwise," and that essentially "the shape of a Q-sort distribution is methodologically and statistically inconsequential" (p. 34). Each grid had three spaces available under the end points, five spaces under the 0 column, and the rest scattered proportionately to resemble a normal curve.

Forty parents agreed to participate in the study as evidenced by signing the informed consent. Upon completion of the Q-sort parents, where instructed to complete the post Q-sort questionnaire. Results to both the Q-sort and the post Q-sort questionnaire were made available to parents upon their request. The 40 Q-sorts were collected from parents in the six weeks from July 30-September 15, 2014. Parent availability determined the time and location for Q sort

administration and the post sort questionnaire completion, but most sorts were conducted on the weekend at the parents' home.

Data Analysis

Q methodology distinguishes itself from other methodologies as that it employs an inverted factor analysis for interpretation (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). This approach analyzes data by-person as opposed to by variable (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Correlations between individual Q-sorts were gathered through the use of the PQMethod correlations correlation matrix. The factor analysis produces participants' opinion grouping around a specific topic. The resultant opinion groupings or factors are statistically distinct from other opinion groupings that may emerge from the analysis (Stainton-Rogers, 1991). The emergent factors are described as groupings of Q-sorts that have distinct commonality to each other (Brown, 1993). Q-sorts belonging to one factor are highly correlated with each other and are not highly correlated with other factors, which represent different opinion groupings. This shift in focus and methodology toward eliciting the subjectivity of Q methodology is represented by the fact that people, and not traits or statements, are the variables correlated in the data analysis (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). This was a parametric study because of the inverted quasi-normal distribution. The variables are then, the parents performing the Q-sort, not the statements that the parents will be sorting. This method allowed the researcher to discover groups of parents that represented a certain value, attitude or perception about elements that most encouraged and supported parent participation in a college preparatory program.

Consequently, the resulting factors from this study will represent clusters of parents who hold similar views regarding what they perceived as important in supporting and encouraging parent involvement in the college-going process and the weight or "loadings," that indicated the

strength of an individual participant's agreement with those factors (Janson, 2007). Factor loadings indicate the degree to which each Q-sort is associated with a given composite factor array. In essence, factor loadings are correlation coefficients (McKeown & Thomas, 1998). Factor loadings are statistically significant ($p < .01$) if they are in excess of ± 2.58 times the standard error (SE). Standard error was calculated utilizing the following equation: SE = where N is the number of statements in the Q sample (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). For this study SE = .40, so factor loadings in excess of $\pm$ 2.58 (.40), or $\pm$ .408 were considered statistically significant.

Each Q-sort had a factor loading which demonstrated the degree of association between the response pattern of an individual Q-sort and all the emergent factors. Individual Q-sorts, then, have stronger or weaker correlations with the emerged factors. For instance, an individual's positive loading on one factor indicates the magnitude of that person's shared subjectivity with others on that factor, and a negative loading indicates a participant's subjective disagreement, or rejection, of the underlying structured meaning of that factor (McKeown & Thomas, 1988).

Factor rotation is a statistical procedure that is employed in Q methodology to "maximize the purity of saturation" of Q-sorts on emergent factors (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 52). The purpose of such a statistical procedure is to change the "vantage point" of the Q-sorts across the factors, but does not disturb the inherent relationships of the individual sorts as expressed by the correlation matrix (p. 52). Varimax rotation was the process used by the researcher in which the data were mathematically manipulated to optimize the separation and distribution of individual Q-sorts across the factors (Stainton-Rogers, 1991). Essentially, Varimax factor rotation is a statistical procedure that approximates simple structure. Put another way, the process of Varimax

rotation provides a clearer picture of the positive and negative relationships among the perspectives represented across the different factors.

For this study, the researcher entered the Q-sorts and correlated and factor analyzed the data utilizing the PQMethod 2.06 freeware for Q analysis (Schmolck & Atkinson, 1997). Correlation analysis entailed a correlation matrix with the entire set of Q-sorts as variables. Resulting factors represented distinct clusters of viewpoints or perspectives held by participants who had similar perceptions of how they behave as leaders in schools

As a result of the factors representing perspectives or viewpoints on a topic at hand, fuller meanings embedded within factors are more easily accessed, by consulting with individuals who completed sorts (McKeown & Thomas, 1998). Brown, Durning, and Selden (1999) suggested individual interviews should be conducted with participants following their performance of their Q-sorts in order to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon being studied. In this spirit, the researcher asked participants to respond to the post sort questionnaire in writing. McKeown and Thomas (1998) refer to those individuals whose Q-sorts contain factor loadings that are highly associated with an individual factor as exemplars. These participants with exemplar sorts expressed their subjectivity in a way that best represented the underlying meaning of a given factor. The data collected from the post-sort questionnaires of those participants with exemplar sorts were used to thicken the narrative description of the perspectives represented by each factor.

The post sort questionnaire revealed the participants' descriptions and explanations as to why they sorted the Q sample as they did. The questionnaire elicited more details regarding the idiosyncratic views and perceptions of those individuals whose sorts loaded significantly on the factors. Questions included in the post sort questionnaire focused on how participants understood

and perceived the stimulus statements that composed the Q sample, as well as how the participants made decisions regarding the placement of those items within the quasi-normal forced distribution. The prompts and questions included in the post sort questionnaire included the following:

1. Describe why the two items you placed at the (+4) and one question in (+3) where most encouraging and supportive to your participation.

2. Describe why the two items you placed at the (-4) and one question in (-3) where least encouraging and supportive to your participation.

3. Please list and describe any other program elements that you perceived to be important to your involvement but where not represented in the items you sorted.

Summary

Largely absent from the literature pertinent to parent involvement in the college-going process are the perspectives of involved parents. These parents may be able to provide important views on how to more effectively reach parents and increase parent involvement. Much of the current literature on parent involvement is conceptual in nature, and rooted in parent models, socio-economic factors, school leadership and school context. This research is designed for the purpose of illuminating parent views about their experiences that encouraged and supported their participation in the college-going process.

Q methodology was used to explore parent perceptions about elements that most encouraged and supported their participation in parent programs because of its potential to assess participants' perspectives on this topic. Additionally, Q methodology provided a way to analyze the resulting data in a manner that limited the capacity for the researcher to infringe on the subjective views of the participants (Brown, 1993). The research instrument, or Q sample, was composed of opinion statements derived from surveys completed by parents, as well as items selected from literature pertinent to literature on parent involvement. Forty parent participants completed Q-sorts based on their experiences in a TRIO parent program. The resulting data were analyzed through factor analysis and post-sort interviews. In Chapter IV the researcher reported

the results of the data analysis and in Chapter V the researcher discussed the results and provided implications for future practice and research.

CHAPTER 4

Results

The purpose of this Q study was to explore parental perceptions about the elements of a federally funded pre-college program that encouraged and supported their participation in the college going process of their child. The data for this chapter was gathered from 40 Q sorts completed by parents of students who had graduated high school, were enrolled in a program of postsecondary study within the following year, and had been enrolled in a pre-college program. These 40 participants sorted 33 statements describing program elements that impacted their decision to participate. The research question guiding the study was, "what were parent perceptions of TRIO program elements that supported and encouraged their involvement in their children's college-going process?" In this chapter the researcher reports the results from the statistical analysis of the 40 Q sorts, as well as the qualitative analysis of the resultant statistical results and data. This chapter presents data analysis, data description, and data interpretation.

Q Data Analysis

The central purpose of Q methodology is to identify and describe distinct subjective perspectives that exist around a topic, question, or phenomenon. Q methodology is designed to examine human subjectivity through both quantitative and qualitative research procedures (Watts & Stenner, 2014). Watts and Stenner (2014) further explain that Q Methodology,

> "Combines the gathering of data in the form of Q sorts and their subsequent intercorrelation and factor analysis. A well-delivered Q study reveals the key viewpoints extant among a group of participants and allows those viewpoints to be understood holistically and to a high level of qualitative detail." (Watts & Stenner, 2012 p. 4)

The quantitative data analysis aspect of Q methodology consists of three statistical procedures: correlation of individual Q sorts, factor analysis, and the computation of factor scores (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Correlation indicates the degree of similarity between each individual participant's Q sort and each of the others. Next, factor analysis is the procedure, through which researchers ascertain how Q sorts are mathematically correlated, or how they cluster themselves into factors. As part of the factor analysis, these statistically distinct factors are also examined in order to determine how they each are both similar and dissimilar to the other factors.

Next, qualitative research techniques are used in order to make meaning of the resultant statistical factors. In order to do so, factor scores are generated for each of the statements within each of the factors, and these factor scores are then re-positioned within the original Q sort distribution (the same one used to collect the initial participant sorts) so that each factor is represented by a factor array which represents a mathematical "model Q sort" for each factor (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 53). The statistical data analysis software used for the quantitative procedures in the researcher's data analysis for this study was the freeware computer program PQMethod 2.06 (Schmolck & Atkinson, 1997).

Correlation Between Sorts

The process of factor analysis begins with the computation of a correlation matrix (McKeown &Thomas 1988). Brown (1993) stated that the computation of correlations between individual Q sorts is "a necessary way station through which the data must pass on the way to revealing their factor structure" (p. 11). For this study, then, the computation of the correlation matrix was the initial procedure in the process of discovering the factors within the Q sort data. PQMethod 2.06 (Schmolck & Atkinson, 1997) produced a correlation matrix that showed how

each participant's Q sort correlated with each of the other sorts included in the study. A correlation of 1.0 between any two sorts would represent complete agreement, while a correlation of -1.0 would represent complete disagreement. A correlation of 0.0 would indicate an absence of a correlation between two sorts, neither agreement nor disagreement.

The computation of the correlation matrix provides a visual representation for the relationships between individual Q sorts. Thus, a high correlation between two sorts indicates a close relationship between them. In other words, those participants in this study who had Q sorts that were highly correlated had similar perceptions program elements that encouraged and supported their program participation. The correlation matrix of the Q sorts for this study is presented in Appendix J.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is the statistical means by which the perceptions of the participants are grouped into a factor structure (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). These groupings, called factors, represent groups of Q sorts that have similar characteristics to each other (Brown, 1993). In other words, Q sorts that group themselves into one factor represent individual perspectives that share a collective similarity, or "family resemblance" (McKeown & Thomas, 1998). These Q sorts belonging to similar groups, or factors, are highly correlated to each other, but are not correlated with other factors. For this study, the factors represent the distinct collective of parental perceptions about how program elements encouraged and supported their participation in the college-going process of their student.

A Q methodology study can use one two methods of factor analysis in order to extract factors from the correlation matrix: Centroid analysis or principal components analysis (PCA). McKeown and Thomas (1988) noted that the specific factoring method "makes little difference,"

adding that "the resultant factor structures differ little from one another in any appreciable aspects" (p. 49). PCA was selected for extracting factors for this study because it has been described as being "more elegant and mathematically precise" of the two factor extraction methods (p. 49). Essentially, PCA is said to be more mathematically precise because it extracts factors in a way that puts as much variance as possible on the first factor, the next largest amount on the second, etc., in a way that is most parsimonious where the most variance explained with the fewest possible factors (Janson, 2007). PQMethod 2.06 (Schmolck & Atkinson, 1997) is equipped with both of these two methods of factor analysis to extract factors and the researcher used PCA in order to extract the factors for this study.

Factor loadings indicate the degree to which each Q sort is associated with a given factor. In essence, factor loadings are correlation coefficients (McKeown & Thomas, 1998) indicated the degree of statistical association between an individual sort and an individual factor. Factor loadings are statistically significant ($p < .01$) if they are in excess of $\pm$ 2.58 times the standard error (SE). Standard error was calculated utilizing the following equation: SE = $1/\sqrt{N}$ where N is the number of statements in the Q sample (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). For this study SE = $1/\sqrt{33}$ = .158, so factor loadings in excess of $\pm$ 2.58 (.158), or $\pm$ .408 were considered statistically significant. Just as with the relationship between any two sorts can be positive or negative, individual sorts can load on factors either positively (+) or negatively (-). Factor loadings that are significant and negative, mean that those sorts bear a statistical similarity to the structure of the idealized, composite factor array, but in an inverted or "mirror imaged" way. When multiple factor loadings on a factor are negative, that factor is considered to be "bipolar." In other words, that factor represents two inversely related perspectives that still share a common structure that is "mirror imaged" (Watts & Stenner, 2012)

Factor Extraction

Regardless of the kind of factor analyses, each has a "potentially infinite number of acceptable solutions" (Watts & Stenner, 2012, p. 92). For a Q methodology study as well, then, the research has to decide which factor solution is the best based upon considerations that are statistical, but more importantly contextual. For this study, the researcher examined the statistical considerations in order to determine and decide on a factor solution, but the contextual considerations – as expressed through the resultant factor arrays – were ultimately most informative to the decision. Specifically, the researcher selected 3-, 4-, and 5-factor solutions for comparison in order to inform the decision regarding the factor solution. The 3-factor solution was rejected because it accounted for markedly less explained variance (37%) than either the 4- or 5-factor solutions, it accounted for fewer participants loading on at least one factor (34 of 40 participants), and the correlation between two of these three factors was higher (.42) than the correlations between factors for either the 4- or 5-factor solutions.

From a statistical standpoint, the 4- and 5-factor solutions were very similar. Both accounted for a relatively high amount of explained variance (45% for the 4-factor and 49% for the 5-factor). Both of these factor solutions also had a high amount of participant sorts loading on at least one factor (39 of 40 for the 4-factor and 38 of 40 for the 5-factor). Finally, both factor solutions had very low correlations between factors. The highest correlation between any two factors for the 4-factor solution was .29, while the highest correlation between any two factors for the 5-factor solution was .27. As a result, the statistical considerations for deciding between the 4- and 5-factor solutions were not differentiating. Therefore, the researcher chose the 4-factor solution over the 5-factor solution because of contextual and theoretical considerations. Specifically, the factor arrays in the 4-factor solution provided clearer perspectives – particularly

within the context of the statements that were "most like" these perspectives, which were those statements under the +4 column. Notably, 4 of the 9 participants who comprised the third factor within this 4-factor solution were negative loadings, a condition that distinguishes it as a bipolar factor. As a result, the researcher described 5 perspectives within this 4-factor solution: one perspective for the first, second, and fourth factors produced by this factor solution; then two perspectives for the third factor. Thus, when the factors are described, analyzed, and discussed they were labeled Factor A (first statistical factor), Factor B (second statistical factor), Factor C and D (third statistical factor), and Factor E (fourth statistical factor). Table 1 shows the Factor extractions.

Table 1

Statistical Information Used to Determine Factor Extraction

Factor Rotation Solution	Eigen Value Included	Explained Variance	Number of Participants Loaded	Correlation Among Factors	Statistical Reasoning
5 Factors	2.3-8.4	49%	38 out of 40	All below .27	Not Rejected because it includes a high number of participants loading on 1 factor, low correlation and high % explained variance.
4 Factors	2.7-8.4	45%	39 out of 40	All below .29	Not rejected because it includes the most number of participants and has the highest correlation value among factors.
3 Factors	2.9-8.4	37%	34 out of 40	All below .42	Rejected because it has a lower explained variance and a lower correlation value among factors.

Factor Rotation

Principal components analysis (PCA) produces unrotated factors, which by themselves are generally of limited interest to researchers because they only provide the "raw materials" for

examining perceptions that are of interest (Brown, 1994, p. 112). Consequently, some method of factor rotation is used in order to "maximize the purity of saturation" of as many different Q sorts on one of the factors that were initially extracted (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 52). For this study, Varimax rotation was used to rotate the factors. Varimax factor rotation is frequently used in Q methodological studies because it finds the most elegant statistical solution that groups as many Q sorts as possible on each factor. In doing so, Varimax rotation reduces any "muddling" that occurs when individual Q sorts either load on more than one factor or fail to load on any (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 52). Importantly, Varimax rotation optimizes separation among the factors without altering the relationship that underlies them, as expressed by the correlation matrix. The process of Varimax rotation, then, provides a "more focused view" of the factors (Brown, 1999, p. 616). For these reasons, Varimax factor rotation was adopted for this study. Table 2 shows the factor loadings.

Table 2

Factor Loadings

Sort ID	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
1	0.1711	0.1946	0.1237	0.3767X
2	-0.135	0.4987	0.3427	0.3391
3	0.6074X	0.0471	0.2492	0.1064
4	0.2998	0.2885	0.363	0.4302
5	0.4073	0.0896	0.1507	0.4952X
6	0.0976	-0.3988	-0.0427	0.5918X
7	-0.0008	0.1288	-0.1209	0.6952X
8	0.5979X	0.2865	0.0846	0.2758
9	0.2039	-0.0651	0.7725X	0.2386
10	0.384	0.4843	0.3506	0.0821
11	0.5007	0.3235	0.4228	0.2826
12	0.2341	0.7087X	-0.1544	-0.2572
13	0.1914	0.0937	0.5703X	0.3936
14	0.5371X	0.4132	0.1154	0.2177
15	0.6474X	0.0368	-0.0043	0.0609

16	-0.0054	0.1287	-0.5773X	0.1306
17	0.2762	0.5675X	0.3091	0.2899
18	0.6889X	-0.0693	0.0242	0.2217
19	0.4770X	0.0497	0.1622	-0.035
20	0.3949X	0.2559	0.1046	-0.0212
21	0.0010	0.2558	0.0145	-0.6595X
22	-0.0861	0.2340	-0.6280X	0.0599
23	0.4660X	0.0251	0.0452	-0.0140
24	0.5283	0.0527	-0.3602	-0.3384
25	0.4256X	-0.0175	0.3514	0.1997
26	0.0870	0.1666	0.6220X	0.0638
27	0.1790	0.0752	0.5229X	0.3906
28	0.1266	0.4369X	-0.2293	0.0086
29	0.0253	0.2079	-0.5809X	0.1472
30	0.0387	-0.6838X	0.2169	0.0727
31	0.8084X	0.1726	-0.0439	0.1490
32	0.5834X	0.2039	-0.1430	0.0191
33	0.5822X	0.2013	-0.1309	0.4399
34	0.7347X	-0.1793	0.0410	-0.0479
35	0.4634	-0.4565	0.0553	-0.1416
36	0.5064X	-0.0151	0.0701	-0.0781
37	0.3702	-0.0966	-0.5773	0.3090
38	0.3383	0.0163	0.1649	0.0928
39	-0.0798	0.0362	0.0047	0.5091X
40	0.2900	0.1168	0.3443X	0.0066
% Explained variance	17	8	11	9

Correlation Between Factors

A correlation matrix of the factor scores shows to what extent the factors are related to each other. Table 1 contains the correlation matrix of factors for this study. Correlations can range from -1.0 to 1.0, with a 1.0 correlation indicating complete agreement and a -1.0 indicating complete disagreement. Correlations higher than .408 would indicate that those two factors are statistically similar and thus represent relatively high levels of agreement or relatedness between those two factors. In contrast correlations less than .408 would indicate lower levels of agreement or relatedness as well as distinction from a statistical standpoint (Brown, 1999). For this study, the correlations between the statistical factors were low. The highest correlation

between statistical factor scores was between factors 1 and 2 (.2904). Table 1 shows the correlation between each of the statistical factors to the others. These correlations demonstrate clear statistical distinction among the factors that contributed to clear and distinct groupings of parental perceptions about the program elements that encouraged and supported their involvement. Correlations between factors are listed in Table 3.

Table 3

Correlations Between Factors

Factors	1	2	3	4
1	1.0000	0.2904	0.1706	0.2378
2	0.2904	1.0000	-0.1002	-0.0996
3	0.1706	-0.1002	1.0000	0.1118
4	0.2378	-0.0996	0.1118	1.0000

Factor Characteristics

Table 4 presents the factor characteristics, including the number of defining variable, the reliability coefficient, the composite reliability scores, and the standard error (SE) of the four statistical factors for this study. The number of defining variables is the number of study participants who loaded significantly and distinctly on each factor. For example, 18 study participants loaded on Factor A.

Reliability is the probability that study participants would perform the Q sort the same way if they performed it again under the same conditions of instruction (Watts and Stenner, 2012). High reliability indicates that the factor scores are stable, given the, assuming the study participant would sort in the same way in subsequent administrations. The reliability for a factor can be estimated through the formula r=0.80/[1+(*p*-1) 0.80], where *p* is the

number of participants defining a factor and .80 is their estimated reliability coefficient (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). As factor reliability increases, the degree of error related to the factor decreases, which leads to a greater confidence in a factor being stable and distinct. The composite reliability for the factors in this study ranged from .94 to .98. These coefficients indicate that the factor arrays distinguish differences in a relatively stable way regarding how the four factors represent parent perspectives about the TRIO program elements that encouraged and supported their participation.

Table 4

Factor Characteristics

	Factors			
	A	B	C	D
Number of Defining Variables	18	8	9	9
Average Reliability Coefficient	0.800	0.800	0.800	0.800
Composite Reliability	0.984	0.941	0.973	0.960
Standard Error of Factor Scores	0.128	0.243	0.164	0.200

Factor Interpretation

Interpretation of Q methodological factors involves the examination of factor arrays, distinguishing statements within the factors, as well as the qualitative data from participants' post sort interviews (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Using these three data sources, the researcher described, examined, and interpreted each of the five perspectives that emerged from the four factors that had been extracted and rotated (for the sake of readability, from this point forward each of these five perspectives will be referred to as "factors"). The examination and description of these five factors lead to the construction of a narrative describing each factor as well as the development of an overall theme for each, which was represented by the name assigned to each factor.

Based on the analysis of these multiple data sets, the five emergent factors for how parents perceived program elements that encouraged and supported parental involvement were appropriately named: (a) Sense of Student-centered Community "Village" Support, (b) Sense of Shared Accountability and Increased Parental Self-efficacy (c) Sense of Parental and Student Improving their Social Capital, (d) Sense of Program Relevance, and (e) Sense of Strong Leadership by a Highly Committed Program Staff. The factor descriptions provided below begin with the demographic information of the participants who comprised each factor, parent's gender, relationship to student, race, parents age at the time of the sort, level of education, and if the parent was of low income status, as determined by their eligibility for free/reduced lunch. A description of each factor was then, provided based upon each factor array. Finally, each of these factor descriptions included quotes taken from the written responses to the post sort questionnaire. The responses from the post sort questionnaire provided a deeper understanding of parental viewpoints contained within each factor regarding the program elements that encouraged and supported their program participation.

Factor A: ***Sense of Student-centered Community and "Village" Support***

Factor A accounted for 17 % of the explained variance in the study with 18 of 40 participants loading on the factor. All sorts were used in the factor rotation, as that no participant loaded significantly on any additional factors. Had any of these sorts loaded on another factor, they would have been eliminated to provide a more lucid view of the factors.

The participants that comprised Factor A included 17 females (16 mothers and 1 grandmother) and 1 male (father). All participants loading on this factor were Black. Data for the age demographic included 5 participants between the ages of 35 and 44 years; 9 participants between the ages of 45 and 54 years; and 4 participants between the ages of 55 and 64 years of

age. The parental education level demographic included 2 participants with high school diplomas, and 16 participants with some college, meaning they had completed at least 1 semester of postsecondary education but had not obtained a four-year degree. All but one of the 18 participants was of low-income status. Demographic data for the participants that loaded on Factor A is provided in Table 5.

Participants who comprised Factor A expressed significant value in being engaged in a community/village culture; based on the data contained in the factor array, data collected from the post sort questionnaire and the distinguishing statements. The Factor A perspective embodied the perception that the "village" helped to support their students, as well as, themselves throughout the college-going process. The relational, community-orientation of this perspective was expressed through preferences for program elements that strongly encouraged and supported participant involvement. This factor also represented the parental viewpoint that parents within the "village" moving in the same direction with the express goal of helping their student become fully prepared for postsecondary study positively impacted their participation.

Table 5

Demographic Information for Participants Loading on Factor A

Sort ID	Parent's Level of Education	Free/Reduced Lunch	Relationship to Student	Parent's Gender	Race	Student's Educational Status	Parent's Age
3	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	41
8	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	43
5	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	55
11	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	50
14	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	46
15	High School	Yes	Father	Male	Black	In College	54
18	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	54
41	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	41
20	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	54
23	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	51
24	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	55
25	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	57

31	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	Military	49
32	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	48
33	Some College	No	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	42
34	Some College	Yes	Grandmother	Female	Black	College Graduate	63
35	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	47
36	High School	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	43

This factor array supported the value that parents placed on having high expectations for their students and participating in program activities that focused on a holistic approach to student development. Within the college-going culture, parents valued how students, parents and staff were operating in concert moving toward the total the goal of college readiness and enrollment. The Factor A perspective was well supported by the statements that sorted at the +4 and +3 positions on the sorting grid.

> 4. Participation in program activities that gave my child an opportunity for student leadership, public speaking, presentation skills and community service encourage and supported my participation. (+4)
>
> 31. The program supported a college-going culture so all the students and parents were moving toward the same goal-college. (+4)
>
> 1. I participated because program practices encouraged me to have high expectations for my child. (+3)
>
> 9. The sense of community. The program became the village for me in helping to educate, love, and steer my children. (+3)
>
> 16. I felt a part of something that I felt was important to my child's success (+3)

According to the factor array, parents valued elements of a college-going culture where having high expectations, help with the college planning process, and wanting to be a part of something they felt was important to their students' success was sorted at the positive end of the sorting grid. The +4 and +3 positions of the sorts identified the above activities as supportive elements for participation. The following responses from the post sort questionnaire further substantiated

parental views regarding the value of the "village", total student development, and the parents' desire to be a part of the students' success:

> It is important for children to be involved in an environment and culture that supports opportunities for academic advancement. (Participant 31)
>
> It really takes a village to raise a kid and I was so happy that people cared about our kids. (Participant 19)
>
> The program supported higher education and being a contributing member of society. (Participant 34)
>
> The program enhancing their skills and giving them the ability to get involved with one another is a great encouragement. (Participant 36)
>
> [The program] Gave my son the opportunity to get a good education and a better life. (Participant 24)

Parents loading on Factor A seemed to be largely student-centered. The Factor A perspective was indicative of the parents' value on program elements that concentrated efforts on the need of the students, as opposed to the needs of the parent. Statements at the +4 position provided evidence that parents felt that student needs came before their own needs. They placed value on the need for relevant program activities and a community/village to help support their students throughout the college-going process.

> 4. Participation in program activities that gave my child an opportunity for student leadership, public speaking, presentation skills and community service encourage and supported my participation. (+4)
>
> 31. The program supported a college-going culture so all the students and parents were moving toward the same goal-college. (+4)

The Factor A perspective also represented the parental viewpoint that parents within the community were moving in the same direction with the express goal of helping their student become fully prepared for postsecondary study, positively impacted their participation. Even

statements that loaded the +2 position focused on the elements that could best benefit the students.

> 5. The program helped me to set a monitoring system of daily activities, homework, how they are doing in school, and college planning encouraged my continued participation.
>
> 6. I saw the bond the staff created with my child, families and the community and I was encouraged to participate.
>
> 26. I was provided valuable information and education regarding the process of gathering documents for financial aid and scholarships.

Conversely, the responses that supported parental value for the "village"; focus on student academic and social development; and the need for high expectations, all within a college-going culture, are further substantiated with responses from the opposite pole. Parent statements sorting at the -4 and -3 positions represented the negative face of the Factor A perspective.

> 21. No one in my family had ever attended college-the program staff taught me what I needed to know about the college application process and what was required. (-4)
>
> 30. The program staff helped me directly with some personal challenges that I faced. (-4)
>
> 19. The cultural experience was an eye opener-I really grew. (-3)
>
> 24. I came because the program allowed me to participate in activities that boosted my leadership skills along with my confidence. (-3)
>
> 32. I was encouraged to participate because the staff and the parent group made use of my gifts and asked me to do things that I was good at. (-3)

Statements sorted at the negative end of the grid seemed to indicate that parent focus was on obtaining the resources with which they were perhaps familiar, but had little or limited access. A parent voicing this view may have said, "I have a good idea about what I need to help my child prepare for college, but I don't know how to access the necessary resources to ensure their success".

The demographic data showed that 16 of the 18 parents loading on Factor A had some college. Two parents loading on this factor reported having family members that had graduated from college and/or had graduated from this program on the post sort questionnaire. Subsequently, these parents had a degree of exposure to college preparation because they were familiar with others who had gone through the process and the transmission of knowledge whether formal or tacit, had occurred.

Parent responses indicated that they were not in need of staff assistance when it came to handling personal challenges in their lives. It seemed as though these parents had other means of handling personal challenges and focused their time and attention, while engaged in program activities, solely on the needs of their child. They utilized the staff to increase their child's preparation for student success.

Parents loading on Factor A indicated that exposure to cultural experiences was not a program element that encouraged their participation, as that this statement was sorted at the -3 position. Parents indicated through myriad responses on the post sort questionnaire that they encouraged diversity in their homes and throughout their lives, so the need for cultural experiences was not an important program element, supporting their participation.

Through the Factor A perspective, parents showed that neither the use of their own gifts and talents nor the need to further their leadership skills, were important elements that supported their participation. Some parents with this viewpoint reported through post sort responses that they held management jobs and positions of leadership at church, and in other organizations. Their participation in these other activities served as a platform for the use of their leadership abilities, as well as their gifts and talents. Although parents reported engaging in leadership

activities and were able to use their gifts to help the program, they were not elements that encouraged them to participate.

Distinguishing statements are helpful in defining and delineating how one perspective is different from the others. Although statements 1 and 9 were prominent characteristics, they were also distinguishing statements. A distinguishing statement ranks significantly different than all the other factors (Watts & Stenner, 2012). The distinguishing statements for Factor A were as follows:

1. I participated because program practices encouraged me to have high expectations for my child. (+3)

9. The sense of community. The program became the village for me in helping to educate, love, and steer my children. (+3)

30. The program staff helped me directly with some personal challenged. (-4)

21. No one in my family had ever attended college- the program staff taught me what I needed to know about the college application process and what was required. (-4)

Demographic data for Factor A reflect a high degree of success through parental involvement in the college-going process, as that 11 of the students had obtained a college degree, 6 were currently enrolled in college and 1 had enlisted in the military, at the time of the sort. Interestingly, there was 1 grandmother with a college degree. The average age of the participants was 50 years. Although not part of the demographic set, 4 parents included in the post sort questionnaire that their college graduate was currently pursuing graduate school.

Summarily, the parents that loaded on Factor A were encouraged to participate because of program elements that facilitated the academic and social development of their child within a family-oriented or "village" like environment. They assigned significant value to program elements that supported effective academic strategies, exposure to community service and

leadership, and other youth development opportunities and being actively engaged in a college-going culture. Participants emphasized the value of feeling like they were part of a family that was advancing to facilitate student success at both the secondary and postsecondary levels.

Factor B: ***Sense of Shared Accountability and Increased Parental Self-efficacy***

Factor B accounted for 8 % of the explained variance in the study with 8 of 40 participants loading on this factor. The participants that comprised Factor B included 8 mothers who were all Black. Data for the age demographic included 2 participants between the ages of 35 and 44 years; 5 participants between the ages of 45 and 54 years; and 1 participant between the ages of 55 and 64 years of age. The parental education level demographic included 1 participant with a high school diploma, 5 participants with some college, and 2 parents with a college degree. All parents were of low-income status. Demographic data for the participants that loaded on Factor B is provided in Table 6.

Table 6

Demographic Information for Participants Loading on Factor B

Sort ID	Parent Level of Education	Free/Reduced Lunch	Relationship to Student	Parent's Gender	Race	Student's Educational Status	Parent's Age
2	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	51
10	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	42
12	College Degree	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	Employed	50
14	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	46
17	High School	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	43
28	College Degree	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	56
30	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	46
35	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	47

Based on the factor array, data collected from the post Q-sort questionnaire, and distinguishing statements participants who comprised Factor B expressed significant value in the trusting relationships (between themselves, program staff and other parents) and accountability

to the parent group and staff, as a platform for sharing resources. The parent responses focused on the value of being connected to staff members and other parents in trusting relationships and having a support system that helped to keep them on track. Parents sorted the responses supporting the value of the relational element, as well as the element of accountability at the +4 and +3 positions of the sorting grid and are as follows:

11. The more I participated the more accountable and successful I felt in helping my child. This played a part in my choosing to participate. (+4)

22. The program staff encouraged me to be more involved through regular phone calls and email contacts. (+4)

10. The program was very cohesive, which caused me to want to participate. (+3)

13. I felt welcome and invited. (+3)

14. I received love, nurturing that encouraged me to stay involved. (+3)

Parents identified the element of trust in relationships as a necessary part of feeling valued as an important part of the college-going process. As parent's participated and experienced success in the process, they tended to view their own actions as valuable to the process and continued to participate, perceiving their participation to be of benefit to their child. Some examples of program successes included, but were not limited the following: student making the honor roll, completing community service hours, participating in the six week residential program; receiving academic, service, civic, or leadership awards and completing scholarship and financial aid applications. Parents gained an increased sense of self-efficacy as their efforts yielded positive results for their child, helping to reinforce their continued participation. Participants identified a synergy between the parents in the group that strengthened the resolve to become and remain actively involved in program activities and supported group accountability.

Parents identified that the actions of staff in making consistent contact with them in a relevant manner, increased their participation. Parents were open to being contacted through email, text messaging, phone and social media by staff and by other parents. According to the demographic data on age, 50% of parents that loaded on Factor B were between the ages of 41 and 49 years. Generally, this age segment has fully engaged in the use of electronic communication and subsequently, preferred receiving text messages and being contacted through social media sites. The other half of the parents ranged in ages from 50 and 63 years. While some were amenable to text messages and social media, several preferred emails and phone calls. No matter the method of contact parents felt supported when contact was made. Parents saw staff making a commitment to help remind them of meetings, deadlines, parent workshops and student assignments, and were supported in their participation.

Statements from the post sort questionnaire revealed the parental viewpoints about the value in being connected to a loving community and accountable for their role in the college-going process.

> Seeing that there are other people outside your family circle that care and want you to be successful is very important in developing young people's mindset of helping others. This program definitely made an impact showing how helping others is a good thing. (Participant 10)

> I know that the more involvement and interest I show the more my daughter would be encouraged. (Participant 17)

> The staff was great. They made me feel welcome. (Participant 2)

> The caring responses from the staff and other parents were very important to us to get them where they needed to be to begin college life. (Participant 28)

On the other hand, parents with the Factor B perspective placed less value on program elements that encompassed the use of their gifts, diversity, and making outside connections. The

statements holding the -4 and -3 positions in the factor array supported the opposing face of the Factor B perspective and are as follows:

19. The cultural experience was an eye opener-I really grew culturally. (-4)

32. I was encouraged to participate because the staff and the parent group made use of my gifts and asked me to do things that I was good at. (-4)

28. I met others that were able and willing to help my child in other areas and I realized that further participation meant more helpful connections. (-3)

33. The efforts of the program staff made a great impact on our course of action, concerning college planning. (-3)

1. I participated because program practices encouraged me to have high expectations for my child. (-3)

Program elements emphasizing diversity and cultural experiences as part of the college-going process and the use of their own gifts and talents, parent indicated, were not as supportive in their decision to participate as that both elements were sorted in the -4 position. Parents reported through their responses on the post sort questionnaire that they were already embracing diversity and culture through the schools they attended, the neighborhoods in which they lived, and other outside activities in which they participated.

Post sort responses from participants with the Factor B perspective revealed they had high expectations for their child before enrolling in the program. Parents enrolling their child in a college-preparatory program on a voluntary basis could support the assumption that these parents had high expectations for their child going to college. Along with voluntary participation in a college-preparatory program comes the opportunity to amass valuable resources to help students become fully prepared for postsecondary success. Parents sorted at the negative end of the grid ascribing less value to making connections and gaining resources from others. Responses from the post sort data are as follows:

> I have raised my kids to live in a diverse society. (Participant 35)
>
> When it comes to my child, I was always involved and diversity has been a part of my family. (Participant 14)
>
> The program gave me other information that was helpful. (Participant 30)
>
> Did not need help with personal stuff, needed to learn about resources. (Participant 17)

The perspective of Factor B rested heavily on the value of the concrete elements associated with a more holistic student success, like setting schedules, checking homework, limiting computer/game time, advising about curriculum and being on the college prep track with a nurturing support system to help them monitor the activities. This perspective leaned toward parents and staff establishing and maintaining a trusting relationship in a nurturing environment where their child could move forward filling educational and social deficits that could serve as barriers to my child's postsecondary readiness, access, and completion.

Apart from describing the Factor B perspective, they were also distinguishing statements. Items 11, 14 and 32, indicated a distinct perspective as related to the other factors. In this regard, as parents became more involved in program activities and experienced success, they become more accountable to staff, other parents and their child, which encouraged their participation. The loving, nurturing environment that they experienced encouraged them to stay involved due to the genuine care and concern they received from the "village." Parent with the Factor B perspective were not encouraged to participate because they asked to use their gifts and talents, the seemed focused on playing their role in the college-going process so that their child had greater changing of achieving success.

> The more I participated the more accountable and successful I felt in helping my child. (Statement 11, +4)
>
> I received love, nurturing that encouraged me to stay involved. (Statement 14, +3)

> I was encouraged to participate because the staff and the parent group made use of my gifts and talents and asked me to do thing that I was good at. (Statement 32, -4)

Among the 8 parents with the Factor B perspective, 1 had a high school diploma, 5 had some college, 2 had college degrees and all were considered low-income. Based on current educational level of the student, 3 were college graduates, 4 were in college, and 1 was employed at the time of the sort. The average age of parents was 48 years.

Factor C: ***Sense of Parent and Student Increasing their Social Capital***

Factor C accounted for 11% of the explained variance in the study with 9 of 40 participants loading on this factor. The participants that comprised Factor C included 9 Black females (7 mothers and 2 grandmothers). Data for the age demographic included 1 participant between the ages of 35 and 44 years; 5 participants between the ages of 45 and 54 years; and 1 participant between the ages of 55 and 64 years of age and 2 between the ages of 65 and 74. The parental education level demographic included 1 participant with a high school diploma, 7 participants with some college, and 1 grandparent with a college degree. All participants were of low-income status. Demographic data for the participants that loaded on Factor C is provided in table 7.

Table 7

Demographic Information of Participants Loading on Factor C

Sort ID	Parent's Level of Education	Free/Reduced Lunch	Relationship to Student	Parent's Gender	Race	Student's Educational Status	Parent's Age
9	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	51
11	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	50
13	High School	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	35
16	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	63
22	College Degree	Yes	Grandmother	Female	Black	In College	68
26	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	45
27	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	50

29	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	47
37	Some College	Yes	Grandmother	Female	Black	College Graduate	70

Parents loading on this factor ascribed value to non-academically related opportunities provided to students like leadership development, presentation skills, public speaking, and community service. Through these student development opportunities both parents and students gained social capital. The factor array identified the statements that supported the Factor C perspective.

> 4. Participation in program activities that gave my child an opportunity for student leadership, public speaking, presentation skills and community service encouraged and supported my participation. (+4)
>
> 9. The sense of community. The program became the village for me in helping to educate, love, and steer my children. (+4)
>
> 20. The parent workshops kept me informed and on track as to what I needed to do as a parent to help my child. (+3)
>
> 28. I met others that were able and willing to help my child in other areas and I realized that further participation meant more helpful connections. (+3)
>
> 31. The program supported a college-going culture so all the students and parents were moving toward the some goal-college. (+3)

For example, students were exposed to volunteers who were experts in their various fields. Through these presenters, coaches, and mentors, students gained knowledge about etiquette, Robert's Rules of Order, foundations of public speaking and presentation skills; as well as opportunities to engage in leadership activities such as the Student Government Association, the Judiciary Committee, and Student Ambassador's. These elements opened avenues to resources for students that would serve them well as they engaged in the college-going process and into college. Through the efforts of the entire learning community, inclusive of all stakeholders, networking and mentoring opportunities became available to students and their parents.

Parents saw the village as a very important resource for student success, as reflected in the factor array. Statement 9, referring to the sense of community and the love they received in within the village that positively steered their child, was sorted at the +4 position. Parents were encouraged to participate because they were valued as being an important part of the process. They also received love and nurturing from parents and staff, which engendered a sense of trust.

Conversely, parents sorted statements that did not encourage and support their participation in the -4 and -3 positions of the sorting grid. Parents with the Factor C perspective indicated that setting a daily routine for students, being loved and nurtured, and interaction with the parent group, were not program elements that encouraged and supported their participation. The following statements were sorted at the -4 and -3 positions, indicating that they were not encouraging elements to participation.

> 5. The program helped me to set a monitoring system of daily activities, homework, how they are doing in school, and college planning, encouraging my continued participation. (-4)
>
> 14. I felt love, nurturing that encouraged me to stay involved. (-4)
>
> 2. Active participation in the program increased my desire to become more involved. (-3)
>
> 3. The program staff assisted me in addressing a family crisis. (-3)
>
> 8. Interaction within the parent group motivated me to become involved. (-3)

The parents loading on Factor C seemed self-directed and had high expectations of their child for going to college. These parents reported having already established a structured routine for their child, and had no need for help with family problems. Their focus seemed to be engaging in the elements that helped to establish vital networks and the academic skills needed for college entrance and college success. Statements for the post sort questionnaire further support the Factor C perspective at the negative pole.

> This was least like my perspective because love, encourage and a family atmosphere was a given. (Participant 9)
>
> I was always a parent that monitored my student's daily activities, homework, school performance and college planning. Therefore the program enhanced what was already being done at home. (Participant 26)
>
> The school that my child attended provided support for college planning. (Participant 29)
>
> We were not faced with any family crisis, but if we had one, the program would definitely help. (Participant 13)

Statement 9 was a dominant factor in describing the Factor C perspective and it was also a distinguishing factor. This distinguishing statement helped to further clarify the Factor C perspective because it shows how important it was for parents to be able to gain resources from this supportive community. Their experiences engaging with other parents, making critical connections that would build social networks, within a loving environment was the essence of the Factor C perspective.

> The sense of community. The program became the village for me in helping to educate, love, and steer my children. (Statement 9)

The demographic profile of the parents with the Factor C perspective revealed of the 9 participants 1 had a high school diploma, 7 had some college, and 1 had a college degree. Additionally, 7 were mothers and 2 were grandmothers, all of low-income status. The current educational status of the students revealed that 2 had graduated college and 7 were currently enrolled. The average age of the participants was 42 years.

Factor D: ***Sense of Program Relevance***

Factor D accounted for 11% of the explained variance in the study with 9 of 40 participants loading on the factor. The participants that comprised Factor D included the same demographic information as Factor C due to the bipolar nature of the factor, and included 9 Black females (7 mothers and 2 grandmothers). Data for the age demographic included 1

participant between the ages of 35 and 44 years; 5 participants between the ages of 45 and 54 years; and 1 participant between the ages of 55 and 64 years of age and 2 between the ages of 65 and 74. The parental education level demographic included 1 participant with a high school diploma, 7 participants with some college, and 1 grandparent with a college degree. All participants were of low-income status. The demographic data for the parents that loaded on Factor D can be found in Table 8.

Table 8

Demographic Information for Participants Loading on Factor D

Sort ID	Parent Level of Education	Free/Reduced Lunch	Relationship to Student	Parent's Gender	Race	Student's Educational Status	Parent's Age
9	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	51
11	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	50
13	High School	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	35
16	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	63
22	College Degree	Yes	Grandmother	Female	Black	In College	68
26	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	45
27	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	50
29	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	47
37	Some College	Yes	Grandmother	Female	Black	College Graduate	70

The parents that loaded on this factor seemed to value the structured program elements leading to college preparation along with being loved and nurtured. The factor array identified the statements that gave credence the Factor D perspective.

4. The program helped me to set a monitoring system of daily activities, homework, how they are doing school, and college planning, encouraged my continued participation. (+4)

14. I received love, nurturing that encouraged me to stay involved. (+4)

2. Active participation in the program increased my desire to become more involved. (+3)

3. The program staff assisted me in addressing a family crisis. (+3)

8. Interaction within the parent group motivated me to become involved. (+3)

Structured program elements included curriculum, information forums, grading monitoring and monitoring of other activities. For example, parents gained knowledge about the use and importance of effective strategies for monitoring computer, game and internet time; homework and class assignments; and grades, through parent workshops and information sessions. Parents were also exposed to strategies for interacting with teachers and administrators at the school level. Parents also perceived that program services were delivered within a loving and nurturing environment. Both program elements that sorted at the +4 position showed activities that were relevant to meeting the academic goals of their child in a positive environment were factors in helping them to remain involved.

Statements 2, 3, and 8 were sorted at the +3 position indicating that active program participation, program staff assisting during a family crisis, and interaction with the parent group, were elements that encouraged and supported their involvement and in some cases, increased their involvement. The positive outcomes derived from active program participation encouraged parents to become more involved, by serving in other components of the program. For example, parents may have decided to serve on an advocacy committee to increase community awareness and engage in efforts to maintain program funding. For many parents, making a decision to become more involved was risky and required a loving, nurturing, and trusting environment, for them to be successful. Post sort responses from parents reflected their value for a loving, nurturing and trusting environment where staff and other parents were able to address the various needs of families, as they arose was an element that supported parental participation.

Post sort responses provided deeper insight about the statements that were sorted at the +4 and +3 positions. For example, several parent responded in agreement with the adage, "It takes a village to raise a child". Other similar statements followed.

> I am a single mother, and program staff helped me to fill in the gap of the support that I was missing. (Participant 9)
>
> This was definitely a community setting and if my child needed extra help in a particular subject they had an instructor to assist with that need. (Participant 26)
>
> I required a lot of support during my time of need, along with resources, they were there to help. (Participant 3)
>
> I was able to obtain guidance with a personal situation due to my involvement. (Participant 27)

At the negative end of the sorting grid, were parents' viewpoints of elements that did not encourage and support their participation. Statements that were sorted at the -4 and -3 positions, reflecting the Factor D perspective are as follows:

> 4. Participation in program activities that gave my child an opportunity for student leadership, public speaking, presentation skills and community service encouraged and supported my participation. (-4)
>
> 9. The sense of community. The program became the village for me in helping to educate, love, and steer my children. (-4)
>
> 20. The parent workshops kept me informed and on track as to what I needed to do as a parent to help my child. (-3)
>
> 28. I met others that were able and willing to help my child in other areas and I realized that further participation meant more helpful connections. (-3)
>
> 31. The program supported a college-going culture so all the students and parents were moving toward the some goal-college. (-3)

Parent responses reflected that program elements inclusive of student development activities, being part of the village, attendance at parent workshops, accountability to the group and the

need for further connections, were perceived as valued less than elements at the positive end of the sort, in supporting their participation.

Parents with the Factor D perspective seemed to value the academic help that was provided to their child, but were less interested in being a part of the village or the community. Perhaps the village was too big, and they were inclined to interact with the parents in the group and the staff with whom they were familiar. Maybe this parent would be happy to attend a parent workshop, but would certainly not engage the presenter at the end of the session for more information about the subject matter.

> Parent workshops did not encourage my participation because I was aware of the information being given. (Participant 22)

> I understood the impact of TRIO programs and valued postsecondary education so I sis not need the support of the group or the village. (Participant 13)

> I had other family members who went to college and hold graduate degrees, so I established a college-going culture very early for my child. (Participant 26)

It was possible that their students received the other components necessary to navigate the college-going process participating in other activities. Church activities, school programs, and family members with college experience are rich caches from which students can gain resources to meet their college goals.

Although the elements that did not support parent participation where components of social capital, cited as critical to college success, most of the parents in this group stated that they child had been successful, nonetheless. Parents reported related to the current educational status of their child, 2 had received a college degree and 7 were currently enrolled in college. These responses indicated that the structured elements and the nurturing environment played a major role in the college success of their child relating to this program.

In addition to statements 1 and 9 being highly representative of the Factor A perspective, they were also distinguishing statements. Distinguishing statements show how factors are distinct from each other, indication that the parents that had the Factor A perspective denoted that program activities that caused them to have high expectation for their child going to college and being part of a "village" were program elements especially important to their participation.

1. I participated because program activities helped me to have high expectations for my child. (+3)

9. The sense of community. The program became the village for me in helping to educate, love, and steer my children. (+3)

Demographic data was used to more completely describe the Factor D perspective. Regarding the parents' level of education, of the 9 parents, 1 parent had a high school diploma, 1 had a college degree and 7 had some college. Seven were mothers and 2 were grandmothers, all of whom were of low-income status. Parents reported that 7 of the students were currently in college and 2 had obtained their college degrees. The average age the parents' was 42 years.

Factor E: ***Sense of Strong Leadership by Highly Committed Program Staff***

Factor E accounted for 9% of the explained variance in the study with 8 of 40 participants loading on the factor. The participants that comprised Factor E included 6 females and 2 males (6 mothers and 2 fathers). Participants loading on this factor included 7 Black and 1 Hispanic). Data for the age demographic included 4 participants between the ages of 35 and 44 years; 2 participants between the ages of 45 and 54 years; and 2 participants between the ages of 55 and 64 years of age. The parental education level demographic included 3 participants with high school diplomas, 4 participants with some college, and 1 parent with a college degree. Six of the 8 participants were of low-income status. Demographic data for the participants that loaded on Factor E is provided in Table 9.

Table 9

Demographic Information for Participants Loading on Factor E

Sort ID	Parent Level of Education	Free/Reduced Lunch	Relationship to Student	Parent's Gender	Race	Student's Educational Status	Parent's Age
1	College Degree	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	44
4	High School	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	41
5	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	55
6	High School	No	Father	Male	Black	In College	56
7	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	55
21	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	37
33	Some College	No	Mother	Female	Hispanic	College Graduate	42
39	High School	Yes	Father	Male	Black	College Graduate	50

The parents that loaded on Factor E identified a distinct value in the leadership of dedicated program staff as an element that encouraged and supported their involvement. The statements if the factor array giving significance to the Factor E perspective were as follows:

> 6. I saw the bond the staff created with my child, families, and the community and I was encouraged to participate. (+4)
>
> 33. The efforts of the program staff made a great impact on our course of action, concerning college planning. (+4)
>
> 15. My interaction with the program director, who put family first-my family, was important to my participation. (+3)
>
> 21. No one in my family had ever attended college- the program staff taught me what I needed to know about the college application process and what was required. (+3)
>
> 31. The program supported a college-going culture so all the students and parents were moving toward the same goal-college. (+3)

Parents felt there was much to gain from the bond that was created between program staff, the students and their families. Through this bond, not only did students and parents gain access to program resources, they had access to the knowledge, insights and experiences that staff members, volunteers, guest speakers and other presenters had and were willing to share beyond programmatic elements, transmitted as social capital.

Parents perceived that the program director and the staff valued what was important to their families. For example, it was important to parents that the staff is considerate of families who have other children that were not in the program, with regard to time and attendance. Students may have outside church or school activities, or community services projects that need to be completed. It was important to parents for staff to allow flexibility within the program rules.

For Factor E it is important to note the perceived value of statements sorted at position +2, to parents. The position of these statements told a story about a host of other activities that were considered less important to their decision to participate, but important, nonetheless. Although these activities on the surface may not appear to directly impact the college going process, parents reported how these activities helped build their self-confidence and develop their leadership skills. These sorts indicated that parents were encouraged by the parent workshops, relevant fundraising activities, and the use of their gifts and talents. Over the years, many parents have stated anecdotally, "I never would have known what I was capable of if you all had not encouraged me to take a leadership role."

14. I received love, nurturing that encouraged me to stay involved.

20. The parent workshops kept me informed and on track as to what I needed to do as a parent to help my child.

28. I met others that were able and willing to help my child in other areas and I realized that further participation meant more helpful connections.

32. I was encouraged to participate because the staff and the parent group made use of my gifts and asked me to do things that I was good at.

Conversely, statements at the opposite end of the grid sorted in the -4 and -3 positions represented the program elements that did not support the Factor E perspective. Parents seemed to place less value on the opportunities provided for their children to engage in public speaking,

enhance presentation skills, and participate in student leadership activities and community service events, as program elements that encouraged their participation. Parents that loaded on Factor E were not encouraged to participate for their own leadership development, assistance handling family crises, exposure to different cultures or to be involved in the parent group.

The statements that were sorted in positions -4 and -3 suggested that parents saw these elements as non-essential in the college-going process or more likely, they had access to these resources through school, church, and other resources within their community. For these parents, choices were critical to them constructing the best college-going experience for their child. Therefore, they put higher value on the program elements to which they had limited access. Outlined below are the statements that parents sorted at the -4 and -3 positions.

5. Participation in program activities that gave my child an opportunity for student leadership, public speaking, presentation skills and community service encouraged and supported my participation. (-4)

24. I came because the program allowed me to participated in activities that boosted my leadership skills along with my confidence. (-4)

2. The program staff assisted me in addressing a family crisis. (-3)

8. Interaction within the parent group motivated me to become involved. (-3)

19. The cultural experience was an eye opener-I really grew. (-3)

Further supporting the Factor E perspective were parent responses from the post sort questionnaire. The parent responses signified that their child was already engaged in student leadership at school and had opportunities to speak publically and participate in community service activities. Parents responded that they were leaders of groups at their church, on a task force at work, and participated in leadership activities within the community. Parents seemed confident that had a family crisis presented itself, that the program staff would have been responsive and attentive to the needs of the family. Finally, parents indicated that they had laid a

foundation of appreciation for other cultures early on in their families. The following statements from the post sort questionnaire lend credence to the factor array for the Factor E perspective:

> My daughter had many of these skills when she came to the program. (Participant 21)
>
> I was already involved in leadership activities at work and at church. (Participant 38)
>
> During my child's participation in the program, we did not have a family crisis however, I am sure if we did they would have assisted. (Participant 4)
>
> I did not have a lot of interaction with the group, but I came because I was able to. (Participant 21)
>
> Things about different cultures and appreciation for diversity had already been taught at home. (Participant 39)
>
> The program staff assisted me in addressing a family crisis. (Statement 3)
>
> I participated because the staff helped me adapt to changes that occurred as my child transitioned into college. (Statement 7)

The demographic lens was used to further expound upon parent viewpoints on the program elements that encouraged and supported their participation. Of the 8 parents loading on Factor E, 3 had high school diplomas, 4 had some college and 1 had a college degree. Six mothers and 2 fathers participated, 7 were Black and 1was Hispanic. Four of the students had college degrees and 4 were currently in college. All but one parent was of low-income status. The average age of the parents was 41.

Consensus Statements

Distinguishing statements help the researcher to understand those statements that are unique to each factor. Consensus statements, on the other hand, do not distinguish between any factors. Consensus statements can signify a number of different things. These statements could mean that the statement was perceived by participants whose perspective comprise all factors, were very similar in powerful ways. In the case where there is a strong reaction to a statement,

those consensus items will fall on one of the far ends (+4 or -4) the sorting grid. In other words, these statements were highly representative at either the negative or positive end of the grid. However, when consensus items fall into the middle of the factor arrays, and reflect 0, +1 or -1 values, this often indicates that those statements either had little value for the participant or were difficult for them to make meaning around. There was only one consensus statement in this study. Statement 7 occupied either -1, 0 or +1 in the five perspective factor arrays. As a result it would appear the participants may have had difficulty making meaning of statement 7.

> I participated because the staff helped me adapt to changes that occurred as my child made the transition to college. (Statement 7)

Summary

This study used Q methodology to examine what parents believed were the program elements that encouraged and supported their participation in a federally funded pre-college program. Forty-parents of federal program participants sorted 33 statements representing program elements that were characteristics on a continuum of "least encouraging and supportive of parental involvement" (-4) and "most encouraging and supporting of parental involvement" (+4). These resulting 33 sorts were factor analyzed and rotated. Subsequently, four factors emerged that represented unique perspectives of parents with students in a federal pre -college program with regard to the program elements that encouraged and supported their participation.

The overarching themes captured by all factors were community support, the sense of being a part of the "village", and the importance of strong relationships. Parent responses indicated that these elements were pivotal in their decision to be involved. The interpretation of these factors generated themes that aided in the identification of the factors: (a) A sense of student-centered (community) support, (b) A sense of shared accountability and increased

parental self-efficacy, (c) A sense of parents and students building social capital, (d) A sense of program relevance and (e) A sense of having highly committed program staff.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

This study examined the perceptions of parents about the elements that encouraged and supported their participation in the college-going process of their child in a federally funded TRIO program. The study was framed utilizing existing parental involvement (Hoover - Dempsey& Sandler, 1997) and Social capital (Bourdieu, 1988; Coleman, 1977) theoretical models. The study explored parental perspectives about the program elements that encouraged and supported their participation in the college-going process. The study addressed the following research question: What were the program elements that encouraged and supported parental involvement in the college-going process of your child in the TRIO program?

The current and historical literature on parental involvement provided the context for studying parental involvement in the college-going process. The relevant definitions for terms characterizing parent involvement, theoretical constructs, and parental demographics were outlined to clarify the conceptual framework. The relevant definitions also discussed eligibility criteria for TRIO programs. A review of the TRIO eligibility criteria will be helpful in this discussion. The federal regulations for the Upward Bound Program (a specific TRIO program) require that two thirds of all participants must be of low-income status AND be a potential first generation college student; one third can be either low-income OR a potential first generation college student. The program was voluntary and program acceptance implied that parents had the desire to see the child obtain a college degree.

The Q methodology was utilized for this study. The methodological and philosophical values of Q methodology were outlined and the research design was described. The research

process was advanced in two stages. The first stage involved contacting parents via phone to ascertain their interest in study participation. Once they had agreed to participate either verbally or by text message, stage 2 of the research process began. Parents participated in the Q sort and completed the post sort questionnaire and provided current demographic information during stage 2 of the research process.

An examination and discussion of the findings related to parent perceptions was the cornerstone of this research endeavor. The parents' demographic information and their perceptions about program elements that supported their participation were discussed. A discussion of the factor analytic procedures employed in the study was provided, including a description of factor rotation, factor extraction, and the selection of the 4-factor solution used in this study. An examination of the factor arrays for each of the 4 statistical factors (yielding 5 perspectives) was provided as well as, the correlations. Finally, each of the 5 factors was interpreted using factor arrays, distinguishing statements and parent responses to the post sort questionnaire. The five elements were named: (a) the sense of student-centered community "village" (b) The sense of shared accountability and increased parental self-efficacy, (c) the sense of students and parents increasing social capital, (d) sense of program relevance (e) the leadership of highly committed program staff. The interpretation of the 5 factors led to the resultant conclusions and recommendation outlined in this chapter.

The most prevalent themes revealed in the research were the importance of being involved in a village/community environment and the importance of relationships as expressed by the Factor A and the Factor B, respectively. Being a part of this village seemed to fulfill the parents' need to feel welcome and invited. Within the "village" parents felt loved, nurtured, and supported throughout the process. Study results confirmed the findings of the Hoover-Dempsey

and Sandler Model (1997) that when parents were required to participate or when they were invited to participate by staff, their children, and in this study, other parents.

Parents expressed that they felt a part of something that was important to their child's school success. They derived a sense of success when they were invited and/or required to participate in the college-going process of their child, reflecting the Factor A perspective. Epstein (1987) has shown that middle class school practices are often barriers to the parent feeling invited to the process. This program was operated on the campus of a private post secondary institution where these same middle class practices could have served as barriers for the parents as they helped their child through the college-going process. In efforts to remove these class barriers, the TRIO program practices included hiring of staff who overcame similar barriers that the target population faced as they experienced the program.

The Factor A "student-centered community 'village' support" perspective seemed to support the importance of parental involvement in the village/community. The "village" coupled with the relationship element seemed to be the foundation upon which all other program elements were delivered to the students and their parents. The Factor A perspective also supported that program practices helped to clarify parental viewpoints about the value of a college education and the role of the parent, especially when parental involvement in the college-going process did not hold high value in the parents family of origin.

This study demonstrated the development of parental self-efficacy (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997) about engaging in the college-going process with their child. Parents shared that they felt connected to and accountable for their role in the college-going process, within the "village." Parents shared how being accountable to program staff, other parents, and their child offered an opportunity to be consistent in their participation. Parents' consistent participation in

the program contributed to an increased appreciation for the college-going process. Parent reports about how they learned to help in the college-going process, further evidenced the development of parental self-efficacy. Overall, these types of program experiences contributed to the development of parental self-efficacy, particularly for the parents of low-income, first generation students.

The Factor B "sense of shared accountability and increased parental self-efficacy" perspective clearly revealed that being connected to the people in the "village" and being accountable to them for their parent role in the college-going process was a program element that encouraged and supported their participation. Parent viewpoints were firm on the importance of being connected to program staff and other parents, creating synergy where one parent's excitement about a particular program activity encouraged other parents to also participate in program activities. A culture for group accountability was established as parents met regularly to discuss program activities and offer suggestions for program improvement.

Roberts (1992) stated that parents of low-income, first generation students want to be involved in the educational experiences of their child but do not know how to access the necessary resources. Lack of access to these critical resources is a barrier to effectively navigating the college-going process. As a result, parents turn to schools to help access their social capital (Choy, Nunez, & Chen, 2000). In the case of this study, parents turned to the TRIO program for help to acquire the necessary resources to help their child prepare for college. Program participants gained access to critical resources including academic advising, rigorous coursework, test preparation, relationships with program staff, relevant networks and assistance with completing college and financial aid applications.

Bourdieu (1986) and Coleman (1998) identified parental involvement as a type of social capital that not only provides access to critical resources for college but, potentially increases college enrollment (McDonough, 1997; Perna and Titus, 2005). Once parents obtain necessary social capital they benefit by being better equipped to navigate the college-going process.

The Factor C "sense of parent and student gaining social capital" perspective emerged as a prominent viewpoint about the program elements that encouraged and supported their participation. However, some parents reported that building social capital was less important than having a sense of community. Such parents typically had varying levels of college experience themselves, and found greater value in the sense of community that was offered through this TRIO program. These families often enrolled in the program with more access to social capital. The students of these parents often participated in other pre-college initiatives, at church or in other pre-college initiative and academic program and extracurricular activities that were available to them. Through these activities outside the TRIO program, parents gained resources to expand their networks, and build their social capital. Although these parents indicated that they valued social capital less than the sense of community, post sort remarks revealed that parents benefited greatly from other important program elements that their child had access to only because of TRIO program participation.

The Factor D "sense of program relevance" perspective highlighted the value of a program that was relevant and sensitive to the needs of the child and the parents and was acknowledged as a program element that encouraged and supported parental participation. The role of program staff was an integral part helping to make the program experience sensitive to the academic, personal, and social needs of the child and the family. Parents stated that the ability of program staff to make the entire program experience relevant for them was an

important factor that encouraged their participation. Seldom do school practices allow for flexibility in scheduling, curriculum choices, and in dealing with the complexity of family issues. Parents found great value in being able to share personal or family challenges and having staff respond in ways that were helpful for their particular situation. No matter the challenge facing the child or the family, be it a necessary change in academic programming or an alternate schedule to accommodate a job, program staff made a way for the child and the family to maximize their participation and involvement in a manner that worked for the family. Program staff took into consideration issues and challenges that could hinder the child's progress in college-going process, and attempted to remove barriers, thereby facilitating student success.

Parents indicated that strong leadership by highly committed program staff, the Factor E perspective, was a prime reason for their continued program participation. The program staff was confident in the direction they were leading the parents and students. Staff was knowledgeable about program elements such as workshops informing parents of the college application and financial aid application process. Parents reported that the staff was patient with students in their learning process, flexible when dealing with complex family issues and they were kind and compassionate when dealing with families. Staff participated in regular professional development where best practices from other TRIO programs were shared. Staff members were updated on policies, legislation and best practices for enhancing and strengthening the program to benefit students and their families. A distinction of Trio programs is the recruitment of staff who shared similar backgrounds to the students being served (34 CFR, Part 645), so that they were able to empathize with families as challenges presented themselves.

Summary

Current and historical research support that consistent parental involvement helps to chart a student's course for college. Specific parental practices such as enrolling students in a rigorous curriculum, monitoring homework, participating in school activities, encouraging student development activities, and assisting with the financial aid process have been found to be helpful in preparing students for college (Barnes & Weikart, 1993; Berla & Henderson 1984; Lunenberg & Ornstein, 2000); Tierney, 2001) and are confirmed by the parents perspectives in this study.

The findings of this study represent constructs that have been absent from the existing body of knowledge about the first person perspectives about parental participation in the college going process of low-income, first generation students. The program elements that encouraged and supported parental participation were identified as being involved in a village/community of parents and students that were moving in parallel fashion to the college goal; being connected to the community and being accountable for the role they played in the college-going process; having opportunities students and parents to increase their sense of self-efficacy and expand their social capital, and being guided by highly committed program staff. The research findings have implications for program development and design and provided insight into program practices for parent program components aiming to increase postsecondary readiness and access, and overall student success at both the secondary and postsecondary levels.

Limitations

The limitations to this study on parental involvement in the college-going process were concerned with the nature of the study population and the limited racial make-up of the study participants. The study population was limited to those parents whose child had enrolled in a program of postsecondary study within a year of high school graduation. Subsequently,

important parental viewpoints, from those who actively participated but did not meet the college enrollment condition, were missed.

An additional limitation pointed to the lack of ethnic diversity, as that all but 2 of the study participants were Black. The TRIO program recruited students from select target schools. For this study, each of the three target urban schools had a population of Black students that was at least 90 percent, so the program population reflected the demographics of the target school. The perspectives of parents from other diverse groups, therefore, about parental involvement in the college-going process were absent. The fact that most of the study participants were Black could be considered a strength as opposed to a limitation because such data could provide valuable information to programs with similar ethnic make-ups.

Implications for Program Practice

Based on study results, there are several implications for program practices emphasizing the sense of community, connectedness and accountability, relationships, critical resources, program relevance and having a highly committed staff. The research also has implications for professional development with the context of college access for low-income, first generation student. The research implies that parental involvement may increase if program practices include establishing a sense of community and developing strong relationships within a parent program, where parents are viewed as important to the college-going process.

If parents are more connected to the college-going process and held accountable by the group they may be more inclined to participate. When parents perceive they are gaining valuable resources to help their child and themselves in the college-going process and for years to come, their participation may increase. In addition to gaining valuable resources, parents participated more when their skills, gifts and talents where used to improve and enhance the program.

Finally, the research implied that a highly committed staff was invaluable to the leadership of the college-going process, if parental participation is to increase. There is inherent value in employing program staff that overcame academic, economic, and social barriers to obtaining the college degree, but there is a need for staff training that presents best practices in providing services that are relevant and sensitive to parents from diverse background. Parent programs that included the above elements in some way had the potential to increase parental participation.

Using Q Methodology, this study confirmed previous findings related to parental involvement The Factor A perspective described how parents being a part of a "village" and having strong relationships, within a college-going culture encouraged and supported their participation. The "village" provided a loving, nurturing environment (Statement 14) where parents felt welcome and invited (Statement 13). The Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1997) Model of Parent Involvement confirmed that when parents felt welcome and invited they were more involved with their child's educative process. Within the college-going culture this study found that parents were encouraged to participate when there was a cohesive program (Statement 10) where opportunities for their child to be involved in leadership, community and other student development activities were available (Statement 4).

Along with the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1997) Model supporting the parents' need to feel welcome and invited, this study also confirmed their construct of parental self–efficacy as a reason parents chose to be involved in their child's education. The Factor B perspective discussed that parent's found value in shared accountability and increasing parental self-efficacy. In Statement 11, parents expressed the more they participated the more successful the felt in helping their child navigate the college-going process which suggests that when parents participated the became more capable of helping, increasing their parental self-efficacy.

Parental involvement has been cited as a form of social capital (Perna and Titus, 2005; Portes, 1998). The Factor C perspective supports the assertion that parental involvement is a form of social capital acquired through individuals' relationships to others, particularly through memberships in social networks (Portes,1998). Coleman (1998) further asserted the social capital is derived from relationships the student and the parent and other adults who are connected to the school that the child attends. The Factor C perspective described the value that parents placed on being a part of a community and having strong relationships with staff and other parents. This perspective also described important bonds that the program staff created between the child, the families and the community (Statement 6), supporting the Factor C perspective as an element that encouraged and supported parental participation.

Factors A through C supported several assertions by current research about why parents participate in their child's education. The Factor D and E perspectives, however, shed light on elements that have been largely absent from the research. The Factor D perspective described the value placed on program relevance. Program relevance related to how program elements address the particular needs of students and their families. For example parents expressed the following thoughts about how the program was relevant to them: the program staff always put the needs if my family (Statement 6), program staff assisted me in addressing a family crisis (Statement 3), and helped me to set a monitoring system of daily activities and homework, and college planning (Statement 5). Research on program relevance, as related to this study, was absent from the current body of literature.

The Factor E perspective highlighted the value of a highly committed program staff as a program element that encouraged and supported parental participation. Parents expressed that the close-knit relationship and interaction with the program director (Statement 15), staff making

them feel like part of a family (Statement 18), and program staff making an impact on their course of action for college-planning, were specific actions and behaviors on the part of the staff That not only encouraged and supported but also increased their participation. Current research, with regard to The Factor E perspective was absent in the literature as it related to this program.

Using Q Methodology, the current research findings esteemed parent voice in a descriptive account of what parents perceived as the program elements that supported and encouraged their participation in the college-going process of their child. We now know that parents of low-income, first generation students value a program that is sensitive and responsive to the needs of the student and their families. Through parent voice we have discovered the value they have placed on highly committed program staff in the college-going process of their child as they move toward postsecondary enrollment and completion

Recommendations for Practice/ Future Research

Several recommendations for future research were generated by the results of this study. This investigation further validated the use of Q methodology as a tool for educational research. Q methodology is thus, recommended for use in understanding how to increase parental involvement leading to postsecondary enrollment and completion. The Q methodology provides a platform for understanding the rich details captured from the responses of study participants. As a researcher of color and a woman, this study demonstrated well the generation of subjective perspectives and practices for the culturally specific circumstances of African American families navigating the college-going process. It is recommended that the student perspectives of their parents' involvement in the college-going process be explored to understand what they perceive as elements that may increase parental involvement in the college-going process. Furthermore,

this study has methodological implications for conducting culturally sensitive research. Given that the use of Q methodology for this study demonstrated

In developing effective programs it is important to explore what motivates program staff to commit to serving low-income first generation families. It would be telling to investigate the perspectives of groups that are different from this study's population about parent involvement in the college-going process and exploring perspectives of parents around issue of what discouraged their involvement in the college-going process. A final recommendation would be to explore the perceived efficacy of staff training for serving low-income, first generation students pursuing postsecondary education

Concern about the lack of parental involvement in pre-college programs continues to loom large. Pre-college programs that support parent components for low-income, first generation students could see an increase in parental involvement when program services are delivered within a "village" family-oriented environment, when parents are made to feel welcome and invited, when opportunities to increase social capital are available, when services are relevant and sensitive to the needs of the families, and when the program is led by committed program staff. Program recommendations include providing training for program staff that focus on service delivery to participants in relevant and responsive ways. It is recommended that programs be flexible so that parents and students are more likely to experience success in the college-going process. Programs are strongly encouraged to provide the space and place for parents to use their gifts and talents to develop their overall parental self-efficacy.

Conclusion

According to McDonough (1997), students from low-income, first generation families continue to be underprepared and underrepresented in higher education. Many programs at the state and national level have been established to address the issues of under preparedness and underrepresentation of these students. The federal TRIO programs, designed to help address the academic and social barriers associated with poverty, help to prepare students for college and encourage parental participation in the college-going process. This study examined parental perceptions about their participation in the college-going process, in this federally funded program. Specifically, explored were parental perceptions about the program elements that encouraged and supported their participation in a TRIO program.

Parents that participated in the parent component of the TRIO program were involved in myriad program activities that helped to prepare their child for college. Along with the program activities, a system of support was established with the parents as they navigated the college-going process. The program elements were coordinated by program staff, to facilitate student success and to encourage parental involvement. Parents, however, identified five specific program elements that encouraged and supported their involvement in this TRIO program.

The first, and most strongly agreed upon program element was the sense of being involved in a "village" that included parents, staff and students working in tandem toward the goal of college enrollment. Included in the "village" were parents, family members, staff, program volunteers and all associated with the program to carry out the program mission. Within the "village" parents cited strong relationships between other parents and families as well as program staff, as critical to their initial and continued program participation.

The second element cited by parents was the access to critical resources that helped to build social capital for the student as well as the child. Third element that encouraged and

supported parent participation was the ability of the staff to deliver program services in a manner that was relevant to the needs of the family. Finally, parents stated that the guidance of highly committed program staff encouraged and support their participation. These five program elements, parents shared, were part of the equation that helped their child achieve their dream of a college education. At the time this study was conducted, 17 of the students who had graduated within one year of college had obtained their bachelor's degree, 20 are currently enrolled in college, 2 serve in the military and one is employed. Two of the college graduates are currently enrolled in graduate school.

As a former TRIO program director, excitement is generated when the coordinated efforts of parents, schools, early intervention programs and the community as a whole, provides the foundation for just one student to achieve a dream that starts with a college/postsecondary education. Greater excitement occurs when the student decides to get in the game and put forth the effort that will catapult them forward toward the goal of college (Hossler, Schmit, & Vesper, 1999). In order to maximize the efforts of the community, parents must be invited to participate and esteemed as playing a valuable in the college-going process.

This study confirmed the thought that parents want to participate in the college-going process of their child. Not only would they become involved but they would also become engaged in the college-going process, if certain conditions were present. Parents expressed that feeling welcome and invited was a condition that initiated their involvement. They further expressed that the holistic focus on the child, being a part of a nurturing community, and being valued for what they could offer to the program helped to keep they involved. Strong relationships with staff and other parents and services delivered by a staff that was fully committed to the success of my child and to the family where elements that encouraged and

supported program involvement. With the conditions met, increased student success at the secondary level; and increased college-readiness, college enrollment and finally, college completion, could be the achieving reward.

Appendix A

Informed Consent Agreement for Study Participation

University of North Florida
Consent to Participate in Scientific Investigation

Title of Research: Parent Involvement in the College-going Process

Investigator: Glori White Peters, M. Ed.

Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study is to explore parent perceptions and experiences about their participation in the college-going process of their child to discover factors that encourage and support parent participation in the college-going process.

Should you choose to participate in this study you will complete the Q Sort and the Post sort interview. The Sort and the Post sort interview along with demographic information will be conducted in a location that shall be agreed upon by the researcher and the participant. This process will take approximately 1 hour.

Benefits of the Study
The anticipated benefit of the study is the opportunity to discuss your experiences, values, and perceptions identifying factors that encourage and support parent involvement in the college-going process. Results of this study will be used to improve program development and parent involvement practices for all pre-college programs as well as, for schools and other agencies that would like to increase parent involvement.

Risks of the Study
There are no anticipated risks associated with this study

Alternative Treatments
There are no alternative treatments to this study since it does not involve specific treatments or procedures.

Confidentiality
The information gathered during this study will be anonymous. There will be no identifying names associated with the Q sorts. The results of the research will be published in the form of a dissertation and may be published in professional journals or presented at professional, or community meetings.

Withdrawal
Participation is this study is voluntary. At any time you may choose to discontinue your participation in the study without penalty or loss of benefit to which you are otherwise entitled.

Costs and Compensation
There will be no cost for participation in this study. Participants will not be paid to participate.

Questions
For questions concerning this study, participants should contact Glori White Peters at
or Dr. Chris Janson at For

questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the chair of the UNF Institutional Review Board by calling or emailing irb@unf.edu.

Consent to Participate

This agreement states that you have received a copy of this informed consent. Your signature below indicates that you agree to participate in this study. All participants must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant Date

Name of Participant (print)

Signature of Researcher Date

Appendix B

Institutional Review Board Approval

UNF
UNIVERSITY of NORTH FLORIDA.
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
1 UNF Drive
Jacksonville, FL 32224-2665
904-620-2455 FAX 904-620-2457
Equal Opportunity/Equal Access/Affirmative Action Institution

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 22, 2014

UNF IRB Number: 434318-2
Exemption Date: 07-22-2014
Status Report Due Date: 07-22-2017
Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB KLC

TO: Ms. Glori Peters

VIA: Dr. Christopher Janson
LSCSM

FROM: Dr. Jennifer Wesely, Chairperson
On behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board

RE: Declaration of Exempt Status for IRB#434318-2:
"Parental Involvement in the College-going Process"

Your project, "Parental Involvement in the College-going Process" was reviewed on behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board and declared "Exempt" categories 2 & 4. Based on the recently revised Standard Operating Procedures regarding exempt projects, the UNF IRB no longer reviews and approves exempt research according to the 45 CFR 46 regulations. Projects declared exempt review are only reviewed to the extent necessary to confirm exempt status.

Once data collection under the exempt status begins, the researchers agree to abide by these requirements:

- All investigators and co-investigators, or those who obtain informed consent, collect data, or have access to identifiable data are trained in the ethical principles and federal, state, and institutional policies governing human subjects research (please see the FAQs on UNF IRB CITI Training for more information).
- An informed consent process will be used, when necessary, to ensure that participants voluntarily consent to participate in the research and are provided with pertinent information such as identification of the activity as research; a description of the procedures, right to withdraw at any time, risks, and benefits; and contact information for the PI and IRB chair.
- Human subjects will be selected equitably so that the risks and benefits of research are justly distributed.
- The IRB will be informed as soon as practicable but no later than 3 business days from receipt of any complaints from participants regarding risks and benefits of the research.
- The IRB will be informed as soon as practicable but no later than 3 business days from receipt of the complaint of any information and unexpected or adverse events that would increase the risk to the

participants and cause the level of review to change. Please use the Event Report Form to submit information about such events.
- The confidentiality and privacy of the participants and the research data will be maintained appropriately.

While the exempt status is effective for the life of the study, if it is modified, all substantive changes must be submitted to the IRB for prospective review. In some circumstances, changes to the protocol may disqualify the project from exempt status. Revisions in procedures that would change the review level from exempt to expedited or full board review include, but are not limited to, the following:

- New knowledge that increases the risk level;
- Use of methods that do not meet the exempt criteria;
- Surveying or interview children or participating in the activities being observed;
- Change in the way identifiers are recorded so that participants can be identified;
- Addition of an instrument, survey questions, or other change in instrumentation that could pose more than minimal risk;
- Addition of prisoners as research participants;
- Addition of other vulnerable populations;
- Under certain circumstances, addition of a funding source

Investigators who plan to make changes should contact the IRB staff so that the review level can be changed as necessary. If investigators are unsure of whether a revision needs to be submitted, they should contact the IRB staff for clarification.

Your study was declared exempt effective 7/22/2014. Please submit an Exempt Status Report by 7/22/2017 if this project is still active at the end of three years. However, if the project is complete and you would like to close the project, please submit a Closing Report Form. This will remove the project from the group of projects subject to an audit. An investigator must close a project when the research no longer meets the definition of human subject research (e.g., the data are de-identified and the researcher does not have the ability to match data to participants) or data collection and analysis are complete. If the IRB has not received correspondence at the three-year anniversary, you will be reminded to submit an Exempt Status Report. If no Exempt Status Report is received from the Principal Investigator within 90 days of the status report due date listed above, then the IRB will close the research file. The closing report or exempt status report will need to be submitted as a new package in IRBNet.

All principal investigators, co-investigators, those who obtain informed consent, collect data, or have access to identifiable data must be CITI certified in the protection of human subjects. As you may know, **CITI Course Completion Reports are valid for 3 years**. Your completion report is valid through 2/12/2016 and Dr. Janson's completion report is valid through 4/10/2015. The CITI training for renewal will become available 90 days before your CITI training expires. Please renew your CITI training within that time period by following this link: http://www.citiprogram.org/. Should you have questions regarding your project or any other IRB issues, please contact the research integrity unit of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs by emailing IRB@unf.edu or calling

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within UNF's records. All records shall be accessible for inspection and copying by authorized representatives of the department or agency at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner. A copy of this memo may also be sent to the dean and/or chair of your department.

UNF IRB Number: 434318-2
Exemption Date: 07-22-2014
Status Report Due Date: 07-22-2017
Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB KLC

Appendix C

Invitation to Participate in Study

Participant Invitation for Study

My name is Glori White Peters. I am a doctoral candidate conducting dissertation research on parent perceptions about elements of a parent program that encouraged and supported participation in the college preparation of their child. I am requesting your participation in this research study. The research instrument (Q sample) will take approximately 60 minutes to complete.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study. Your participation is voluntary and your responses will remain anonymous. No personal identifiers will be collected. Your participation is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time. There are no foreseeable risks for your participation. One possible benefit from taking part in this research is the knowledge that you are adding to the body of research on parent involvement in the college preparation process.

The University of North Florida, Institutional Review Board has approved this research study. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact the University of North Florida's Institutional Review Board Chairperson by calling or by emailing irb@unf.edu. Should you have any comments or questions, please feel free to contact me at

or Dr. Chris Janson at

Please indicate your interest in participating in this study through an email ( ) or a test message/phone call ( ) with a "YES" response with your name. Further information and instructions will then follow.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Glori White Peters

Principal Researcher

Appendix D

Parent Survey (Open-ended Question)

20. If your child is a junior or senior, please answer the following question as completely as possible: What are the program elements that have encouraged and supported your participation in the UB Parent Action Alliance?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix E

Communication Concourse Including Statements Gleaned from the Research

1. I participated because program practices encouraged me to have high expectations for my child (Reynolds, 1992).

2. Active participation in the program increased my desire to become more involved (Snow et al., 1991).

3. The program staff assisted me in addressing a family crisis.

4. Participation in program activities that gave my child an opportunity for student leadership, public speaking, presentation skills and community service encouraged and supported my participation (Snow et al., 1991).

5. The program helped me to set a monitoring system of daily activities, homework, how they are doing in school, and college planning, encouraging my continued participation (Fehrmann, 1987).

6. I saw the bond the staff created with my child, families, and the community and I was encouraged to participate.

7. I participated because the staff helped me adapt to changes that occurred as my child made the transition into college (Tierney, 2002; Hossler & Stage, 1992).

8. Interaction within the parent group motivated me to become involved (Fehrmann, 1987).

9. The sense of community. The program became the village for me in helping to educate, love, and steer my children.

10. The program was very cohesive, which caused me to want to participate.

11. The more I participated, the more accountable and successful I felt in helping my child. This played a part in my choosing to participate (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995, 1997).

12. My participation was supported by the staff's commitment to diversity helping me better prepare my child for life in a multicultural society.

13. I felt welcome and invited (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997).

14. I received love, nurturing that encouraged me to stay involved.

15. My interactions with the program's Director who put family first – my family, was important to my participation.

16. I felt a part of something that I felt was Important to my child's success (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997).

17. I participated because I was provided vital information and education pertaining applying to colleges (Jeynes, 2011).

18. The program staff made me feel like I was part of a family.

19. The cultural experience was an eye opener – I really grew culturally.

20. The parent workshops kept me informed and on track as to what I needed to do as a parent to help my child (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997).

21. No one in my family had every attended college – the program staff taught me what I needed to know about the college application process and what was required.

22. The program staff encouraged me to be more involved through regular phone calls and email contacts.

23. I was supported in my participation knowing that I could contact the staff with any situation or question I may have concerning my child's college experience.

24. I came because the program allowed me to participate in activities that boosted my leadership skills along with my confidence.

25. I was encouraged to participate because the program helped me develop to be better at helping my child be successful in their personal life as well as their academic career.

26. I was provided valuable information and education regarding to the process of gathering documents for financial aid and scholarships (Engle and Tinto, 2008).

27. The support, sharing and caring of the other parents and the parent team effort we provided to help each other's children succeed (Bourdieu 1977; Coleman, 1989).

28. The program staff encouraged me to be more involved.

29. The parent workshops kept me informed and on track as to what I needed to do as a parent to help my child further his/her education to the next level.

30. The program boosted my leadership skills along with my confidence.

31. Gaining the knowledge of the college options available to my child (Terenzini et al., 1996).

32. Knowing that we can contact the staff with any situation or question we may have concerning my child's stay in college.

33. The support, sharing and caring of the other parents and the parent team effort we provided to help each other's children succeed.

34. I met others that were able and willing to help my child in other areas and realized that further participation meant more helpful connections.

35. The program provided support in the areas of fund raising for things that my child needed, which encouraged me to participate more actively.

36. The program staff helped me directly with some personal challenges that I faced.

37. The staff encouraged me not to give up and to stay involved.

38. I trusted the staff with my child - which made it easy to leave my child in their hands to help mold my child into the best person that they can be.

39. I participated because the efforts of the program staff made a tremendous impact on our course of action as far as college planning was concerned.

40. The program supported a college-going culture so all the students and parents were moving toward the same goal- college.

41. I like the advantage that was offered my child to have the college experience of staying in the dorm during the summer away from home, and knowing that he could be responsible for himself away from home.

42. The resources that are available to help my child and myself to make the right decisions for his/her college career (Jeynes, 2010; Tierney, 2004).

43. The program gave me the assurance that when my child left for college he could handle things.

44. The program gave me the opportunity to experience a preview of what college life would be like for my child without me being there directing him.

45. The college tours gave an insight to our decision of whether my child would go to college locally or to migrate to a different area.

46. The efforts of the program staff made an impact on our course of action as far as college planning was concerned (Horn & Nunez, 2000).

47. The program helped me make better decisions with my own personal budget.

48. The support and encouragement I received from the staff.

49. The program coached and guided me through my child's process for college entry (Moles, 1993; Tierney, 2004).

50. The program staff helped me directly with some personal challenges that I faced.

51. It helped me develop to be better at helping my child be successful in their personal life as well as their academic career.

52. The support, sharing and caring of the other parents and the parent team effort we provided to help each other's children succeed.

53. The kindness of program staff encouraged my participation (Dauber & Epstein, 1989).

54. Program activities like the Talent Show, Olympics, and the Coronation encouraged me to participate in the program.

55. I was able to establish a routine for my child's studying for achievement (Henderson, 1994).

56. Program was important for to be a part of the group, social acceptance (Clark, 1983).

57. I gained confidence participating in the program, my child was proud of me.

58. Because parent workshops and weekly seminars kept me knowledgeable about what I needed to help my child.

59. They told me exactly what I needed to know and did not let me miss any deadlines.

Appendix F

Q Sample

1. I participated because program practices encouraged me to have high expectations for my child.
2. Active participation in the program increased my desire to become more involved.
3. The program staff assisted me in addressing a family crisis.
4. Participation in program activities that gave my child an opportunity for student leadership, public speaking, presentation skills and community service encouraged and supported my participation.
5. The program helped me to set a monitoring system of daily activities, homework, how they are doing in school, and college planning, encouraging my continued participation.
6. I saw the bond the staff created with my child, families, and the community and I was encouraged to participate.
7. I participated because the staff helped me adapt to changes that occurred as my child made the transition into college.
8. Interaction within the parent group motivated me to become involved.
9. The sense of community. The program became the village for me in helping to educate, love, and steer my children.
10. The program was very cohesive, which caused me to want to participate.
11. The more I participated, the more accountable and successful I felt in helping my child. This played a part in my choosing to participate.
12. My participation was supported by the staff's commitment to diversity helping me better prepare my child for life in a multicultural society
13. I felt welcome and invited.
14. I received love, nurturing that encouraged me to stay involved.
15. My interactions with the program's Director who put family first – my family, was important to my participation
16. I felt a part of something that I felt was Important to my child's success.
17. I participated because I was provided vital information and education pertaining applying to colleges.
18. The program staff made me feel like I was part of a family.

19. The cultural experience was an eye opener – I really grew culturally.

20. The parent workshops kept me informed and on track as to what I needed to do as a parent to help my child.

21. No one in my family had every attended college – the program staff taught me what I needed to know about the college application process and what was required

22. The program staff encouraged me to be more involved through regular phone calls and email contacts.

23. I was supported in my participation knowing that I could contact the staff with any situation or question I may have concerning my child's college experience.

24. I came because the program allowed me to participate in activities that boosted my leadership skills along with my confidence.

25. The program helped me to help my child in their personal life and their academic career.

26. I was provided valuable information and education regarding to the process of gathering documents for financial aid and scholarships.

27. Support, sharing and caring of the all parents created a team were we provided assistance to each other's children.

28. I met others that were able and willing to help my child in other areas and I realized that further participation meant more helpful connections.

29. The program provided support in the areas of fund raising for things that my child needed, which encouraged me to participate.

30. The program staff helped me directly with some personal challenges that I faced.

31. The program supported a college-going culture so all the students and parents were moving toward the same goal- college.

32. I was encouraged to participate because the staff and the parent group made use of my gifts and asked me to do things that I was good at.

33. The efforts of the program staff made a great impact on our course of action, concerning college planning.

Appendix G

Post Sort Questionnaire

Post-Sort Questions

1. Describe why the two statements you placed in the +4 column and one of the statements in your +3 column were most like your perspective regarding what encouraged you to be involved in your student's TRIO program.

Card #	Reasons why these statements are most like your perspective and why they are important to you.

2. Describe why the two statements you placed in the -4 column and one of the statements in your -3 column were least like your perspective regarding what encouraged you to be involved in your student's TRIO program.

Card #	Reasons why these statements are least like your perspective and why they are least important to you.

Demographic Information:

1. **What was your level of education when your student was in the program?**

   High School graduate or less_____Some college____Bachelor's Degree or Higher_____

2. **Was your student eligible for free/reduced lunch when they were in the program?**

   Yes_____No_____

3. **What is your relationship to the student?**

   Mother_____ Father_____Grandparent_____ Other_____ (list)

4. **Gender**

   Male_____ Female_____

5. **Race**

   Black_____Hispanic _____White_____Other_____ (list)

6. **What is the educational status of your student today? (check all that apply)**

   Graduated_____(year) In college_____(year) Military____ Employed_____

7. **What is your current age?**

Appendix H

Q Sorting Grid with Instructions

Welcome to my exploratory study on the elements of the TRIO program that encouraged and supported your participation!

DIRECTIONS:

1. First sort the cards first into three piles (least like my perspective, unsure, most like my perspective)
2. Next, sort cards into the grid below.
   - +4s are the "most like" your perspective, +3's slightly less so, and so on to -4's which would be "least like" your perspective
   - Work your way from the outsides to the inside (place +4's and -4's, then +3's and -3's, then +2's and -2's, and so on)
3. Record your card numbers on the response grid.
4. Complete post-sort questions #1-4
5. Record your demographic information.

RESPONSE GRID

What elements best represent *your* perspective about what encouraged and supported your participation in your student's TRIO program?

Least like my perspective Unsure ***Most like*** my perspective

-4 (2 cards)	-3 (3 cards)	-2 (4 cards)	-1 (5 cards)	0 (5 cards)	+1 (5 cards)	+2 (4 cards)	+3 (3 cards)	+4 (2 cards)

Appendix I

P Set Demographic Data

Sort ID	Parent Level of Education	Free/Reduced Lunch	Relationship to Student	Parent's Gender	Race	Student's Educational	Parent's Age
1	Bachelor's Degree	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	45
2	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	51
3	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	41
4	High School	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	41
5	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	55
6	High School	Yes	Father	Male	Black	In College	56
7	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	55
8	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	43
9	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	51
10	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	42
11	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	50
12	Bachelor's Degree	Yes	Father	Male	Black	Employed	50
13	High School	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	35
14	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	46
15	High School	Yes	Father	Male	Black	In College	54
16	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	63
17	High School	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	Employed	43
18	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	54
19	Some College	No	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	41
20	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	54
21	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	White	In College	37
22	Bachelor's Degree	Yes	Grandmother	Female	Black	In College	68
23	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	51
24	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	55
25	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	57
26	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	45
27	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	50
28	Bachelor's Degree	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	56
29	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	47
30	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	46
31	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	Military	49
32	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	48
33	Some College	No	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	42
34	Some College	Yes	Grandmother	Female	Black	College Graduate	63
35	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	College Graduate	47
36	High School	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	43
37	Some College	Yes	Grandmother	Female	Black	College Graduate	70
38	High School	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	Military	66
39	High School	Yes	Father	Male	Black	College Graduate	50
40	Some College	Yes	Mother	Female	Black	In College	41

Appendix J

Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	100	11	23	26	34	21	-1	21	14	30	30	-8	30	16	25	31	51	11	14	22
2	11	100	15	36	14	5	31	24	21	27	34	10	21	43	-24	-16	51	-1	-21	19
3	23	15	100	12	44	14	9	49	41	29	32	13	22	31	-28	-14	49	46	38	45
4	26	36	12	100	33	2	24	54	27	31	77	6	59	28	25	-6	34	30	34	28
5	34	14	44	33	100	34	18	44	32	26	54	0	29	25	26	-9	34	26	39	22
6	21	5	14	2	34	100	32	3	13	-8	1	-52	3	-3	4	-6	40	15	3	-8
7	-1	31	9	24	18	32	100	35	3	0	2	0	12	23	2	12	7	24	-14	17
8	21	24	49	54	44	3	35	100	14	27	44	38	30	36	40	0	28	51	32	52
9	14	21	41	27	32	13	3	14	100	44	46	-19	52	26	16	-44	46	20	19	-6
10	30	27	29	31	26	-8	0	27	44	100	49	17	34	46	28	3	38	32	30	1
11	30	34	32	77	54	1	2	44	46	49	100	5	43	43	29	-13	51	34	42	30
12	-8	10	13	6	0	-52	0	38	-19	17	5	100	1	38	26	1	46	4	11	28
13	30	21	22	59	29	3	12	30	52	34	43	1	100	24	24	-22	30	25	5	2
14	16	43	31	28	25	-3	23	36	26	46	43	38	24	100	22	-10	20	36	1	14
15	25	-24	28	25	26	4	2	40	16	28	29	26	24	22	100	21	21	55	32	34
16	31	-16	-14	-6	-9	-6	12	0	-44	3	-13	1	-22	-10	21	100	2	9	-2	4
17	51	49	34	34	40	7	28	46	38	51	46	30	20	46	21	2	100	23	14	32
18	11	-1	46	30	26	15	24	51	20	32	34	4	25	36	55	9	23	100	30	26
19	14	21	38	34	39	3	-14	32	19	30	42	11	5	1	32	-2	14	30	100	26
20	22	19	45	28	22	-8	17	52	-6	1	30	28	2	14	34	4	32	26	26	100
21	-14	-13	4	-32	-11	-43	-39	-3	-4	8	-13	26	-21	-9	-9	-14	0	-20	-4	4
22	1	-4	-30	-16	-33	-4	17	-6	-47	-10	-23	19	-35	16	-24	3	-8	-11	-24	-8
23	-23	9	20	19	9	0	9	36	13	27	16	25	25	34	23	7	3	30	-6	-11
24	6	-29	21	-10	-19	-8	-13	13	-21	14	-1	17	-12	14	34	41	7	35	3	19
25	30	18	30	38	27	8	-11	19	42	19	52	0	27	42	11	32	41	27	29	14
26	16	22	18	4	12	3	19	12	44	40	16	9	39	34	4	20	32	9	12	24
27	22	11	34	49	9	8	33	28	57	26	39	0	56	26	20	-32	20	22	21	22
28	-4	3	-3	18	22	-14	-4	12	-22	-1	28	41	-11	33	19	11	16	12	21	6
29	2	1	12	-22	17	13	13	-9	-31	2	-3	8	-40	2	-19	34	-9	-17	6	3
30	-1	-16	17	-22	18	22	-1	-4	26	-22	-8	-53	-7	-11	0	-12	-16	10	-7	-4
31	34	39	45	21	46	13	4	43	24	50	44	28	30	53	59	-3	34	39	35	17
32	34	46	39	19	28	23	-8	34	1	36	37	6	6	34	21	6	36	26	24	20
33	9	44	46	20	39	19	39	36	23	47	37	21	21	52	37	6	22	58	29	3
34	14	11	44	0	28	6	-9	28	14	20	16	14	20	54	43	-3	8	38	17	24
35	1	-20	11	20	-15	3	-16	20	5	-21	15	-20	4	14	5	-16	-11	28	20	8
36	-29	27	17	16	17	12	1	26	7	18	41	4	-5	39	14	-8	7	37	6	23
37	-12	-26	-1	12	29	11	32	36	-28	-24	3	21	-6	23	29	22	-14	26	9	10
38	1	17	16	22	18	11	30	36	14	26	21	-3	2	29	26	5	26	23	9	26
39	22	13	-9	11	24	24	19	7	22	0	4	-3	46	12	2	-9	10	-3	-31	-23
40	1	14	14	32	9	25	5	12	29	19	42	6	25	24	21	-17	12	6	22	28

21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
-14	1	-23	6	30	16	22	-4	2	-1	34	34	9	14	1	-29	-12	1	22	1
-13	-4	9	-29	18	22	11	3	1	-16	-16	7	8	-17	-20	27	-26	17	13	14
4	-30	20	21	30	18	34	-3	12	17	45	39	46	44	11	17	-1	16	-9	14
-32	-16	19	-10	38	4	49	18	-22	-22	21	19	20	0	20	16	12	22	11	32
-11	-33	9	-19	27	12	9	22	17	18	46	28	39	28	-15	17	29	18	24	9
-43	-4	0	-8	8	3	8	14	13	22	13	23	19	6	3	12	11	11	24	25
-39	17	9	-13	-11	19	33	-4	13	-1	4	-8	39	-9	-16	1	32	30	19	5
-3	-6	36	13	19	12	28	12	-9	-4	43	34	36	28	20	26	36	36	7	12
-4	-47	13	-21	42	44	57	-22	31	26	24	1	23	14	5	7	-28	14	22	29
8	-10	27	14	19	40	26	-1	2	-22	50	36	47	20	-21	18	-24	26	0	19
-13	-23	16	-1	52	16	39	28	-3	-8	44	37	37	16	15	41	3	21	4	42
26	19	25	17	0	9	0	41	8	-53	28	6	21	14	-20	4	21	-3	-3	6
-21	-35	25	-12	27	39	56	-11	-40	-7	30	6	21	20	4	-5	-6	2	46	25
-9	16	34	14	42	34	26	33	2	-11	53	34	52	54	14	39	23	29	12	24
-9	-24	23	34	11	4	20	19	-19	0	59	21	37	43	5	14	29	26	2	21
-14	30	-34	21	-16	32	-32	11	34	-12	-3	6	6	-3	-16	-8	22	5	-9	-17
0	-8	3	7	41	32	20	16	-9	-16	34	36	22	8	-11	7	-14	26	10	12
-20	-11	30	35	27	9	22	12	-17	10	39	26	58	38	28	37	26	23	-3	6
-4	-24	-6	3	29	12	21	21	6	-7	35	24	29	17	20	6	9	9	-31	22
4	-8	-11	19	14	24	22	6	3	-4	17	20	3	24	8	23	10	26	-23	28
100	-17	11	22	-26	-3	-28	-4	11	-16	6	19	-22	-3	-16	-1	-18	-25	-7	-3
-17	100	1	26	-7	21	-22	16	41	-33	2	3	9	-6	1	-12	28	1	-9	-3
11	1	100	10	31	-2	-1	-14	-3	-12	43	14	42	41	20	31	24	5	10	17
22	26	10	100	-17	-19	-11	0	11	-18	47	64	16	23	33	19	8	20	-6	4
-26	-7	31	-17	100	14	20	1	-14	1	30	11	29	47	44	19	5	-6	4	22
-3	-21	-2	-19	14	100	39	-9	-30	13	12	-9	11	19	-10	12	-32	25	-4	39
-28	-22	-1	-11	20	39	100	-6	-24	-4	26	-2	31	8	12	-13	-8	17	20	23
-4	16	-14	0	1	-9	-6	100	2	-26	10	9	16	-6	-15	4	28	3	-18	0
11	41	-3	11	-14	-30	-24	2	100	-16	21	24	30	-3	-31	11	25	-19	9	1
-16	-33	-12	-18	1	13	-4	-26	-16	100	-9	-18	-22	17	17	8	1	16	-12	-7
6	2	43	47	30	12	26	10	21	-9	100	62	62	62	17	22	31	18	26	26
19	3	14	64	11	-9	-2	9	24	-18	62	100	26	18	32	26	14	-1	18	16
-22	9	42	16	29	11	31	16	30	-22	62	26	100	40	-2	27	34	14	20	1
-3	-6	41	23	47	19	8	-6	-3	17	62	18	40	100	33	39	27	31	-3	17
-16	1	20	33	44	-10	12	-15	-31	17	17	32	-2	33	100	26	19	12	-11	4
-1	-12	31	19	19	12	-13	4	11	8	22	26	27	39	26	100	8	39	-12	38
-18	28	24	8	5	-32	-8	28	25	1	31	14	34	27	19	8	100	-11	13	-9
-25	1	5	20	-6	25	17	3	-19	16	18	-1	14	31	12	39	-11	100	-32	17
-7	-9	10	-6	4	-4	20	-18	9	-12	26	18	20	-3	-11	-12	13	-32	100	-14
-3	-3	17	4	22	39	23	0	1	-7	26	16	1	17	4	38	-9	17	-14	100

Appendix K

Factor Arrays

No	Statement	Factor Arrays			
		A	B	C	D
1	I participated because prog practices encouraged me to h	3	-3	-1	1
2	Active participation increased my desire to become more	0	2	-3	-2
3	Program staff assisted me with family crisis which encour	-2	-2	-3	-2
4	Participation in program activities that gave my Ss opport	4	1	4	-4
5	Program helped me monitor my Ss daily activities, homew	2	1	-4	0
6	I saw the bond the staff created with my student, others, ar	2	2	1	4
7	Staff helped me adapt to changes that occurred as Ss trans	-1	0	-1	-1
8	Interaction within the parent group motivated my involver	-2	1	-3	-3
9	Sense of community. The program became the village to n	3	1	4	1
10	Program was very cohesive which caused me to participa	2	3	2	0
11	The more I participated the more successful I felt in helpi	1	4	2	0
12	My participation was supported by the staff's commitment	-1	0	2	-1
13	I felt welcome and invited.	-1	3	-2	0
14	I felt loved and encouraged	1	3	-4	2
15	Program staff always put family first	1	0	-2	3
16	I felt I was a part of something important to my student's s	3	2	0	-2
17	I was provided vital info about college application proce	0	1	-1	-1
18	Program staff made me feel part of a family	1	0	-1	3
19	Cultural experiences helped me grow	-3	-4	-2	-3
20	The parent workshops kept me informed and on track	-2	2	3	2
21	No on in my family had attended college and staff helped	-4	-1	-1	-1
22	Staff reached out to me to be mmore involved through regu	0	4	0	-2
23	I knew I could contact the staff with any situation	0	-2	0	1
24	The program allowed me to participate and boost my lead	-3	-2	1	-4
25	Helped my student in their personal life including school	1	-1	1	-3
26	They provided valuable info and exp for financial aid and	2	0	-2	1
27	We created a team of support and assistance to each other	-2	-1	2	0
28	I met others who were able and willing resources to my S	-1	-3	3	2
29	Helped me find funding and money for my Ss	-1	-2	0	1
30	Helped me directly with personal challenges	-4	-1	0	-1
31	The program supported a college-going culture and one go	4	-1	3	3
32	The staff and parents made use of my talents and gifts	-3	-4	1	2
33	The sheer efforts of program staff	0	-3	1	4

References

Adelman, C. (1999). *Answers in the Toolbox: Academic Intensity, Attendance Patterns and Bachelor's Degree Attainment.* (No.1999-8021). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Adelman, C. (2006). *The Toolbox Revisited: Paths to degree completion from high school through college.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Alldred, P., & Edwards, R. (2000). A typology of parent involvement in education centering on children and young people: Negotiating, familialisation, institutionalisation and individualisation. *British Journal of Sociology in Education, 21*(3), 435-455.

Astone, N. M., & McLanahan, S. S. (1991). Family structure, parent practices, and high school completion. *American Sociological Review, 56*(3), 309-320.

Aud, S. H., Johnson, W. F., Kena, F. G., Roth, G., Manning, E., Wang, X., & Zhang, J. (2012). Condition of Education 2012 (NCES 2012-045). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC. Retrieved 6/2/2014 from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

Avshalom, C., Moffitt, E., & Silva, P. (1998). Early failure in the labor market: Childhood and adolescent predictors of unemployment in the transition to adulthood. *American Sociological Review, 63*, 424.

Barth, R. (1979). Home-based reinforcement of school behavior: A review and analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 49*, 436-58.

Becher, R. (1984). *Parent involvement: A review of research and principles of successful practice.* (No. ERIC ED 247032). Washington. DC:

Bempechat, J. (1992). The role of parent involvement in children's academic achievement. *The School Community Journal*, *2*(2), 31-41.

Bempechat, J. (1998). *Against the odds-how at risk students exceed expectations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bempechat, J. (2000). *Getting our kids back on track: Education children for the future.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Benner, A. D., & Mistry, R. (2007). Congruence of mother and teacher educational expectations and low-income youth's academic competence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(1), 140.

Berla, N., & Henderson, A. (1994). *A new generation of evidence: The family is critical to student achievement*. Columbia: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Billson, J., & Terry, B. (1982). In search of the silken purse: Factors in attrition among first-generation students. *College and University, 58*, 57-75.

Bloir, K. (1997). Parenting that promotes resilient urban African American families: Scholars describe the characteristics of their parents parenting behavior. *Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council on Family Relations. 59th. November 7, 1997*

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). Reproduction in education, society, and culture. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of social capital. In J. G. Richardson (ed.), Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant (1992). An invitation to reflexive sociology. *Cambridge: Polity*.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). *Ecological models of human development.* Oxford: Elsevier.

Brown, C. G., Rocha, E., & Sharkey, A. (2005). *Getting smarter, becoming fairer: A progressive education agenda for a stronger nation.* Center for American Progress.

Brown, M. (2004). *Illuminating patterns of perception: An overview of Q methodology* (No. CMU/SEI-2004-TN-026). CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV PITTSBURGH PA SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INST.

Cabrera, A. F., & La Nasa, S. M. (2000). Understanding the college-choice process. In A. F. Cabrera, & and La Nasa, S. M. (Eds.), *Understanding the college choice of disadvantaged students* (pp. 5-22). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Catsambis, S., & Garland, J. (1997). *Parent involvement in students' education during middle school and high school.* Report 18. Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.

Chavkin, N. F., & Williams, D. (1988). Critical issues in teacher training for parent involvement. *Educational Horizons, 66*, 87-89.

Choy, S. (2001). *Students whose parents did not go to college: Postsecondary access, persistence, and attainment.* (NCES No. NCES 2001-126). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Choy, S., Horn, L., Nunez, A., & Chen, X. (2000). Transition to college: What helps at- risk students and students whose parents did not attend college. *New Directions for Institutional Research,* 45-59.

Clark, R. (1983). *Family life and school achievement: Why poor black children succeed and fail*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clark, R. (1993). Homework focused parenting practices positively affect student achievement. In N. F. Chavkin (Ed.), *Families and schools in a pluralistic society*, 85-91.

Clifford, M. (2009). Exploring mentoring experiences in college student affairs: A Q methodology study. A dissertation submitted to the University of North Florida, Jacksonville. Fl.

Coleman, J. (1991). *Parent involvement in education.* (ERIC Document ED 334 028 No. PIP-91-983). Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology 1988, 94*, 95-104.

Coleman, J. S. (1987). Families and schools. *Educational Researcher, August/September*, 32-38.

Comer, J. (1980). *School power*. New York: The Free Press.

Council for Opportunity in Education website (2014) Trio. Retrieved from www.coenet.us

Council for Opportunity in Education website (2014) Trio Programs at a glance. Retrieved from http://www.coenet.us/coe_prod_imis/COE/TRIO/TRIO_Programs/Programs_at_a_Glance/COE/NAV_TRIO/TRIO_Programs_at_a_Glance.aspx?hkey=76fb02cd-137d-4

Council for Opportunity in Education website (2014) Trio History. Retrieved from http://www.coenet.us/coe_prod_imis/COE/TRIO/History/COE/NAV_TRIO/TRIO_History.aspx?hkey=89b3a80a-3a9e-4580-9fda-38156b9318f8

Dauber, S. L., & Epstein, J. L. (1989). *Parents' attitudes and practices of involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools.* (No. 33). Baltimore: Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1991). Involving parents in the school. *American Journal of Education, 100*(1), 20.

Desimone, L. (1999). Linking parent involvement with student achievement: Do race and income matter? *Journal of Educational Research, 9*(1) 11-30.

Dika, S., & Singh, K. (2002). Applications of social capital in educational literature: A critical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 72*(1), 31.

Dornbusch, S., & Ritter, P. (66). Parents of high school students: A neglected resource. *Educational Horizons, 66(*21),75-77.

Eccles, J. S., & Harold, R. D. (1993). Parent school involvement during the early adolescent years. *Teacher's College Record, 94*(3), 568.

Edwards, A., & Warin, J. (1999). Parent involvement in raising the academic achievement of primary school pupils: Why bother? *Oxford Review of Education, 25*(3), 325-341.

Engle, J., & Tinto, V. (2008). *Moving beyond access: College success for low-income, first-generation students.* Washington, D.C.: The Pell Institute.

Epstein, J. (1987). Toward a theory of family-school connections: Teacher practices and parent involvement. In K. Kurrelmann, F. Kaufmann & F. and Lasel (Eds.), *Social intervention: Potential and constraints*. New York: De Gruyter.

Epstein, J. (1987). What principals should know about parent involvement. *Principal, 6*, (9).

Epstein, J., & Dauber, S. (1991). School programs and teacher practices of parent involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools. *Elementary School Journal, 9*(3), 289-305.

Falbo, T., & Amador, N. (2001). Parent involvement during the transition to high school. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 16*(5), 511-529.

Fallon, M. (1997). The school counselor's role in first generation college students' college plans. *The School Counselor, 44*, 384-393.

Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parent involvement and students' achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychological Review, 13*(1)

Fann, K., McClafferty, J., & McDonough, P. (2009). Parent involvement in the college planning process: A case study of P-20 collaboration. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 8*, 374. doi: 10.1177/1538192709347847

Fehrmann, P. G., Keith, T. Z., & Reimers, T. M. (1987). Home influence on school learning: Direct and indirect effects of parent involvement on high school grades. *Journal of Educational Research,* (80), 330.

Feldman, R., & Yershalmi, M. (1998). Parent care and intrusiveness as predicators of the abilities-achievement gap in adolescence. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 39(1), 63-72.*

Ferlazzo, L. (2012, March 12). Re: The difference between parent involvement and parent engagement [post three]. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/teachers/classroom_qa_with_larry_ferlazzo/2012/03/response_the_difference_between_parent_involvement_parent_engagement.htm

Ferlazzo, L. & Hammond, L. (2009). Building parent engagement is schools. Santa Barbara, CA.: Linworth

Finn, J. (1998). Parent involvement that makes a difference. *Educational Leadership, 55*(8), 8.

Gladieux, L., & Swail, W. (2000). Beyond access: Improving the odds of college success. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(9), 68-74.

Goodall, J. & Montgomery, C. (2013). Parent involvement to parent engagement: A continuum. *Educational Review, 66(4), 399-410.*

Gorman, T. (1998). Social class and parent attitudes toward education. *Journal of Contemporary*

Ethnography, 271(1), 56-60.

Green, C., Walker, J., Hoover-Dempsey, K., & Sandler, H. (2007). Parents' motivations for involvement in children's education: An empirical test of a theoretical model of parent involvement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(3), 53-62.

Griffin, J. (1996). Relationship of parent involvement, empowerment, and school traits to student academic performance. *Journal of Educator Research, 90*(1), 33-40.

Gupton, J. T., Castelo-Rodíguez, C., Martínez, D. A., & Quintanar, I. (2009). Creating a pipeline to engage low-income, first-generation college students. In S. R. Harper, & S. J. Quaye (Eds.), *Student Engagement in Higher Education* (pp. 243-260). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gutman, L., & Midgley, C. (2000). The role of protective factors in supporting the academic achievement of poor African-American students during the middle school transition. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 29*(2), 223-234.

Hackert, C., & Brachler, G. (2007). FlashQ[computer software]. Retrieved July 12, 2014, from http://www.hackert.biz/flashq/downloads/

Henderson, A. (1981). Home environment and intellectual performance. In R. Henderson (Ed.), *Parent-child interaction: Theory, research and prospects*. New York: Academic Press.

Henderson, A. (1987). *The evidence continues to grow: Parent involvement improves student achievement*. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Hilton, J. M., & Desrochers, S. (2002). Children's behavior problems in single-parent and married-parent families: Development of a predictive model. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 37*, 13-36.

Hoover-Dempsey, K., & Sandler, H. (1995). Parent involvement in children's education: Why does it make a difference? *Teacher's College Record, 97*, 310-321.

Hoover-Dempsey, K., & Sandler, H. (1997). Why do parents become involved in their children's education? *Review of Educational Research,* (67), 3-10.

Hoover-Dempsey, K., Bassler, O., & Brissie, J. (1987). Parent involvement: Contribution to teacher efficacy, school socioeconomic status, and other school characteristics. *American Educational Research Journal, 24*(3), 417-435.

Horn, L., & Nunez, A. (2000). *Mapping the road to college: First generation students' math track, planning strategies and context of support.* (statistical analysis No. 2000-153). Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics, USDOE.

Hossler, D., & Stage, F. K. (1992). Family and high school experience influences on the postsecondary educational plans of ninth-grade students. *American Educational Research Journal, 29*, 425-451.

Hossler, D., & Stage, F. K. (1989). Differences in family influences on college attendance plans for male and female ninth graders. *Research in Higher Education, 30*(3), 301-315.

Hossler, D., Schmit, J., & Vesper, N. (1999). *Going to college: How social, economic, and educational factors influence the decisions students make.* Baltimore: JHU Press.

Inman, W., & Mayes, L. (1999). The importance of being first: Unique characteristics of first-generation community college students. *Community College Review, 26*, 3-22.

Janson, C. A. (2007). *High school counselors' perceptions of their educational leadership behaviors: A Q methodology study*. (Order No. 3279202, Kent State University). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses* 218. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/304834967?accountid=14690. (304834967).

Jeynes, W. H. (2010). *Parent involvement and academic success*. New York, NY.:Routledge.

Jeynes, W. H. (2007). The relationship between parent involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement: A meta analysis. *Urban Education, 42*(1), 82-110.

Jeynes, W. H. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relation of parent involvement to urban elementary school students' academic achievement. *Urban Education, 40*(3), 37-49.

Jun, A., & Colyar, J.E. (2002). Parent guidance suggested: Family involvement in college preparation programs. In W. Tierney, & L. and Hagedorn (Eds.), *Increasing access to college: Extending possibilities to all students.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Keith, T. Z., & Keith, P. B. (1993). Does parent involvement affect eighth grade student achievement? Structural analysis of national data. *School Psychology Review, 22*(3), 474-496.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. Random House, LLC

Lareau, A. (1987). Social class differences in family-school relationships: The importance of cultural capital. *Sociology of Education, 60*, 73-87.

Lareau, A. (2000). *Home advantage: Social class and parent intervention in elementary education.* Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Lareau, A., & Horvat, E.M. (1999). Moments of social inclusion and exclusion: Race class and cultural capital in family school relationships. *Sociology of Education,* 37-53.

Los Angeles Unified School District Instructional Support Services. K-12 College-going culture initiative. October 2006 Retrieved 9/12/2014 from http://notebook.lausd.net/pls/ptl/docs/PAGE/CA_LAUSD/FLDR_ORGANIZATIONS/COMMITTEE_MAIN/COMMITTEE_CURR_INSTRUCT/COMMITTEE_CURR_INSTRUCT_AGENDA/TAB 2A-ATTACHMENT A - ACTIVITIES FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.PDF

Lee, J. S., & Bowen, N.K. (2006). Parent Involvement, cultural capital, and the achievement gap among elementary school children. *American Education Research Journal,* 43, 193-218.

Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action.* New York NY.: Cambridge University Press.

Lunenberg, F., & Omstein, A. (2000). *Educational administration: Concepts and applications*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Luster, T., & McAdoo, H. (1996). Family and child influences on educational attainment: A secondary analysis of the high/scope Perry Preschool data. *Developmental Psychology, 32*(1), 26-39.

McKenna, M. K., & Millen, J. (2013). Look! listen! learn! Parent narrative and grounded theory models of parent voice, presence, and engagement in K-12 education. *School Community Journal, 23(1), 9-48.*

Marjoribanks, K. (2003). Family background, individual and environmental influences, aspirations and young adults' educational attainment: A follow-up study. *Educational Studies, 29*,(2-3), 233-242.

Martin, J. D. (2009). *How school practices to promote parent involvement influence student success*. THE CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY AND SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY.

Martinez, M., & Klopott, S. (2005). *The link between high school reform and college access and success for low-income and minority youth.* New York: Pathways to College Network and American Youth Policy Forum.

McCarron, G. P., & Inkelas, K. K. (2006). The gap between educational aspirations and attainment for first-generation college students and the role of parent involvement. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(5), 534-49.

McCurdy, K., & Daro, O. (2001). Parent involvement in family support programs: An integrated theory. *Family Relations, 50*(2), 113-121.

McDonough, P. M. (1997). Choosing colleges: How social class and schools structure opportunity. Albany: State University of New York Press.

McKeown, B. F., & Thomas, D. B. (1988). *Q methodology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McNeal, R. B. (1999). Parent involvement as social capital: Differential effectiveness on science achievement, truancy, and dropping out. *Social forces*, *78*(1), 117-144.

McNeal, R. B. (2001). Differential effects of parent involvement on cognitive and behavior outcomes by socioeconomic status. *Journal of Socioeconomics, 30*(2), 171-187.

McSwain, C., & Davis, R. (2007). *College access for the working poor: Overcoming burdens to*

succeed in Higher education. Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy. (IHEP)

Moles, O. (1982). Synthesis of recent research on parent participation in children's education. *Educational Leadership,* (November), 44-47.

Moles O. (1993). Collaboration between schools and disadvantaged parents: Obstacles and openings. *Families and schools in a pluralistic society, 168,* 21-49.

Moles, Jr. O.C. (2005). School-family relations and student learning: Federal education initiatives. *School-family partnerships for children's success*, 131-147.

Nardine, F.E. (1990). The changing role of low-income minority parents in their children's schooling. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, (48),* 67-80.

Neuenschwander, M. P., Vida, M., Garrett, J. L., & Eccles, J. S. (2007). Parents' expectations and students' achievement in two western nations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*, 594-602.

Noguera, P. A. (2003). The trouble with Black boys: The role and influence of environmental and cultural factors on the academic performance of African American males. *Urban Education*, *38*(4), 431-459.

Olmstead, P.P., & Rubin, R.I. (1983). Parent involvement: Perspectives from the follow-through experience. In R. Haskins, & D. and Adams (Eds.), *Parent Education and Public Policy*. 112-140.

Pascarella, E. T., Pierson, C. T., Wolniak, G. C., & and Terenzini, P. T. (2004). First-generation college students: Additional evidence on college experiences and outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education,* (May-June), 1-38.

Perna, L., & Titus, M. (2005). The relationship between parent involvement as social capital and college enrollment: An examination of racial/ethnic group differences. *The Journal of Higher Education, 75*(5), 42.

Pianta, R., & Walsh, D. (1996). *High-risk children in schools: Constructing sustaining relationships.* New York: Routledge.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *The Annual Review of Sociology, 24*, 1-24.

Raffaele, L., & Knoff, H. (1999). Improving home school collaborations with disadvantaged families: Organizational principles, perspectives, and approaches. *School Psychology Review, 28*(3), 448.

Robbins, P., & Krueger, R. (2000). Beyond Bias? The promise and limits of Q method in human geography. *Professional Geographer, 52, 636-648.*

Roberts, J. (1992). Parents can be mentors, too. *Gifted Child Today, 15*(3), 36-38.

Schweinhart, L., Barnes, H., & Weikart, D. (1993). *Significant benefits: The high scope Perry Preschool study through age 27.* Ypsilanti, MI: High Scope Educational Research Foundation.

Seyfried, S. F., & Chung, I. (2002). Parent involvement as parent monitoring of student motivation and parent expectations predicting later achievement among African American and European American middle school age students. *Social Work with Multicultural Youth, 11*, 109-131.

Singh, K., Bickley, P. G., Trivette, P., Keith, P. B., & Anderson, E. (1995). The effects of four components of parent involvement on eighth-grade student achievement: Structural analysis of NELS-88 data. 24, 299-317. *School Psychology Review,* (24), 299-317.

Snow, C. E., Barnes, W. S., Chandler, J., Goodman, I. F., & Hemphill, L. (1991). Unfulfilled expectations: Home and school influences on literacy. Harvard University Press.

Stanton-Salazar, R., & Dornbusch, S. (1995). Social capital and the reproduction of inequality: Information networks among Mexican-origin high school students. *Sociology of Education, 68*(April), 116-135.

Steinberg, L. (1996). *Beyond the classroom: Why school reform has failed and what parents need to do.* New York: New York: Touchstone.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S., Dornbusch, S., & Darling, N. (1987). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development, 63*(5), 1266-1281.

Stevenson, D. L., & Baker, D. P. (1987). The family-school relation and the child's school performance. *Child Development, 58*, 1348-1357.

Sui-Chu, H., & Williams, J. (1996). Effects of parent involvement on eight-grade achievement. *Sociology of Education, 69*(2), 126-141.

Swail, W., & Perna, L. (2000). *A view of the landscape: Results of the national survey of outreach programs*. *Outreach handbook* 2001. New York: The College Board.

Terenzini, P. T., Springer, L., Yaeger, P. M., Pascarella, E., & Nora, A. (1996). First-generation college students: Characteristics, experiences, and cognitive development. *Research in Higher Education, 37*(1), 1-22.

Thayer, P. (2000). Retention of students from first-generation and low-income backgrounds. *Opportunity Outlook,* (May), 2-8.

Thorkildsen, R., & Stein, M. R. (1989). Is parent involvement related to student achievement? Exploring the evidence. *Research Bulletins Online, 22.*

Tierney, W. (2002). Parents and families in precollege preparation: The lack of connection between research and practice. *Educational Policy, 16*, 588.

Tierney, W. (2004). Academic triage: challenges confronting college preparation programs. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10*, 950.

UPWARD BOUND, 34 C.F.R. Part 645 (2010)

Trusty, J. (2000). High educational expectations and low achievement: Stability of educational goals across adolescence. *Journal of Educational Research, 93*(6), 356.

U. S. Department of Education. (1994). *Strong families, strong schools: Building community partnerships for learning.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education. (1998). *Toward resiliency: At-risk students who make it into college*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education (2000) Goals 2000, Educate America Act. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/legislation/GOALS2000/TheAct/index.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2002a). *No child left behind.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Education (2013). Poverty guidelines. Retrieved from (www.2edgov/about/offices/list/ope/trio/incomelevels.html)

Vitti, N. P. (2012). *Developing Demand Parents: A Case Study of Miami Dade County Public Schools' Parent Academy* (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Education).

Walberg, H. (1984). Families as partners in educational productivity. *Phi Delta Kappan, 65*(6), 397-400.

Walker, J., Wilkins, A., Dallaire, J., Sandler, H., & Hoover-Dempsey, K. (2005). Parent involvement: Model revision through scale development. *The Elementary School Journal, 106*(2), 85-98.

Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2012). *Doing Q methodological research: Theory, method and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Weikart, D. (1988). A perspective in high scope's early education research. *Early Childhood Development, 33*(4), 29-40.

Wimberly, G. L., & Noeth, R. J. (2004). *College readiness begins in middle school.* Iowa City, IA: ACT.

Zellman, G., & Waterman, J. (1998). Understanding the impact of parent school involvement on children's educational outcomes. *Journal of Educational Research, 91*(6), 370.

Zhan, M. (2006). Assets, parent expectations and involvement, and children's educational performance. *Children and Youth Services Review, 28*, 961-975.

Zook, J. (1995). Lobbying for survival: TRIO programs point to success stories. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 41*(39), 36.

Vita

Glori White Peters

Education

2014	Doctor of Education	University of North Florida Educational Leadership
1987	Master of Education	University of North Florida Guidance and Counseling
1983	Bachelor of Arts	Jacksonville University Sociology

Professional Experiences

2013-2014	Grant Writer	City of Jacksonville
1999-2012	Director of the Office of Student Success Programs	Jacksonville University
1995-1999	Resource Development Officer	Florida State College @ Jax
1993-1995	Guidance Counselor	Duval County Public Schools
1991-1993	Coordinator of TRIO-McNair Program	Jacksonville University

Honors

2009	Unsung Hero Award	Florida Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel (FAEOPP)
2008	Trio Achiever's Award	Southeastern Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel (SAEOPP)
2006	Omni Award Nominee	Education